

SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

**LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT
and
OPERATIONS AND SOURCING MANAGEMENT**

**DOCTORAL PROGRAMS DESCRIPTION
AND DOCTORAL STUDENT MANUAL**

Michigan State University
Approved August 2015

Note: Program applicants desiring further information should contact:

Logistics Doctoral Program

or

Operations and Sourcing Management Doctoral Program

Michigan State University Department of

Supply Chain Management N370 North

Business Complex

East Lansing, MI 48824-1122

(517) 353-6381

CONTENTS

Topic	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS	4
III. BASIC DEGREE REQUIREMENTS	5
A. Development of Competency.....	5
B. Course Requirements for Logistics Program	7
C. Course Requirements for Operations and Sourcing Program	8
D. Second Year Research Paper	9
IV. THE LOGISTICS FIELD EXAMINATION	9
A. Purpose and Objectives of the Logistics Field Exam	9
B. Structure of the Examination	10
C. Timing and Preparation for the Exam.....	10
D. Grading	11
V. THE OPERATIONS AND SOURCING MANAGEMENT FIELD EXAMINATION..	12
A. Purpose and Objectives of the OSM Field Exam	12
B. Student Eligibility and Time Limit	12
C. Content and Structure of the OSM Field Exam	12
D. Timing and Preparation for the Exam.....	13
E. Exam Grading Process	14
VI. THE DISSERTATION	15
A. The Dissertation Committee	15
B. Dissertation Proposal Defense.....	16
C. University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS).....	16
D. Final Dissertation Presentation	16
E. Dissertation Project: A Word of Caution	17
F. Example Timetable for Program Completion.....	17
G. Checklist and Deadlines.....	18
VII. GUIDELINES FOR INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP	18
A. Criteria for Dismissal.....	19
B. Faculty Expectations for Doctoral Students	19
C. Faculty Responsibilities in Mentoring and Guidance	20
D. Feedback to Doctoral Students.....	20
E. Review of Documents in Academic Files	21
F. Teaching Eligibility and Requirements	21
VIII. CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION TO DOCTORAL CONSORTIA	22
IX. THE FACULTY	22

X.	LIST OF APPENDICES	23
	A. Report of the Faculty Advisor Form - Doctoral Program	24
	B. Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria.....	26
	C. Student Progress Evaluation Form.....	29
	D. Academic Policies.....	31
	E. University Resources	33
	F. Code of Teaching Responsibility.....	34
	G. Teaching Eligibility and Requirements.....	21
	H. Graduate Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures.....	35

Special thanks to the Departments of Management and Information Technology Management for providing the template for this document.

INTRODUCTION

The Supply Chain Management Doctoral Programs at Michigan State University offer their students the opportunity to study the complete breadth and depth of logistics, operations and sourcing within the context of overall supply chain management. The logistics doctoral program (LDP) and operations and sourcing management doctoral program (OSMDP) are interdisciplinary and include faculty trained in logistics, marketing, operations, procurement and management science. This combination of skills offers students a broad range of scholarship and research opportunities.

The LDP and OSMDP place primary emphasis on the development of scholars who intend to pursue academic careers at research universities. The LDP expects students to develop competence in logistics and in the general field of supply chain management. The OSMDP curriculum expects students to develop competence in operations and sourcing management. Such scholars should be capable of generating and applying knowledge in the broad area of supply chain management as well as in their specific functional areas, and disseminating that knowledge.

Students in the LDP and OSMDP are encouraged to design individually meaningful courses of study within the larger context of supply chain management. Within the programs, students are expected to focus their efforts on empirical or analytical research methods to address theory driven research issues in either the logistics or the operations and sourcing management area, accordingly.

Students in the doctoral program are required to commit full-time attention to the program; part-time enrollment is not allowed.

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

Application to the program requires the following materials:

1. A completed on-line application for admission to graduate studies at Michigan State University (MSU) with fees paid. The application form can be obtained on-line at <http://grad.msu.edu/apply/>.
2. College transcripts showing grades received while pursuing all prior undergraduate and graduate degrees if any. Official copies should be sent directly to the Department of Supply Chain Management (see aforementioned address and contact information).
3. Three letters of reference from individuals able to appraise the candidate's personal interests, abilities, and the likelihood of successful completion of the Ph.D. Program.
4. Standardized Test Scores: The Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) is preferred but Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores may be considered. English language requirements for the program are the same as those for the University. Applicants without full native fluency in English must fulfill proficiency requirements as defined by the University (for details, see <http://grad.msu.edu/apply/docs/international.pdf>). The program does not allow provisional admission; applicants must demonstrate proficiency prior to admission.
5. A written statement of personal goals. This statement should address (a) your primary interest area within logistics or operations and sourcing management; (b) why you believe

the program and faculty at Michigan State University fit your interests, and (c) your career objectives upon completion of your degree. This statement should be no longer than two pages (double-spaced).

6. A pre-admission interview is encouraged. Prior to making a final decision regarding admission, the candidate should complete an interview with at least two faculty members. Ideally, this interview would be conducted on-campus, but, when a campus visit is not possible, phone interviews may be conducted.

The Logistics Doctoral Program Committee (LDPC) is comprised of up to four logistics faculty appointed by the Department Chairperson. The LDPC screens applications to determine the fit with current logistics faculty. The OSM Doctoral Programs Committee (OSMDPC) is comprised of up to four operations and sourcing faculty appointed by the Department Chairperson. The decision regarding admission is based on the applicant's GMAT score, grade point average, goal statement, letters of recommendation, and previous work and/or academic experience. Applicants passing this initial screening are then considered for admission by the LDPC or OSMDPC respectively. Specific entrance criteria change from year to year, but it is generally the case that an applicant will not be accepted if his/her GMAT Cumulative score is lower than 640. Students begin the program in the Fall semester. The program admits 1-2 students every year in each of the two areas. If no acceptable candidates are available, no admissions will be made.

Since the program expects full-time participation in doctoral studies, research, and teaching, each student is admitted with a combination of graduate assistantships and fellowships that are expected to continue during a four-year period. For the nine-month academic year, these assistantships include a monthly stipend and a tuition allowance that generally covers all tuition. Students are also offered the opportunity to teach or do research during the summer for additional support. Depending on availability and student interest, the graduate assistantships includes both teaching and research opportunities. The composition of financial support might vary from year to year. The offer will be communicated in writing for each candidate when admission is granted to the program. There is particular interest in recruiting candidates who are eligible for university fellowships (see <http://grad.msu.edu/universityfellowships/> and <http://www.finaid.msu.edu/grad.asp> for additional details).

Upon acceptance into the doctoral program, the LDPC or OSMDPC will assist students in the selection of a Program Guidance Committee (PGC). The PGC consists of two or more faculty whose role is to provide mentoring and guidance to the student during the doctoral program. Further, the PGC will work with the student during the first year of the program to develop a curriculum plan using the "Report of the Doctoral Guidance Committee" form (Appendix A).

BASIC DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETENCY

The LDP and OSMDP concentrate on developing a student's knowledge in the specific fields of logistics or operations and sourcing management, and in the general field of supply chain management. First, all students take a series of four core seminars that cover topics in the field of logistics or operations and sourcing management depending on the student's major. Second,

each student completes a minor in a related field, (e.g., information technology management, international business, marketing, microeconomics, operations and sourcing management, logistics, etc.). Third, the student completes courses focusing on research methodology. The culmination of this preparation is the written comprehensive examination in the student's major.

The Major Courses

The major courses focus on the fundamental infrastructures, processes, decisions, technologies, issues and considerations in the field of logistics or operations and sourcing management. There are four major courses, and each course is 3 credit hours (12 total credit hours) for each major. The *logistics* courses include examination of logistics theory with an overview of transportation-distribution research and network analysis; an in-depth understanding of logistics public policy to examine the relationship between governments, logistics/distribution carriers and operators, and logistics users; and an foundation course on the techniques and methodologies used in logistics research, including simulation. Additionally, students have an elective choice in the major course series to include either a seminar in inventory or a seminar in procurement and sourcing theory. The *operations and sourcing management* include contemporary research in operations management, operations strategy, inventory management, and procurement and sourcing theory. Additionally, students can do an independent study with a faculty member to pursue a specific topic of interest with the concurrence of the guidance committee.

The Minor Courses

A minor field of study outside of the major is selected by each student. Ideally, the minor field complements the major in support of the dissertation research as well as future teaching and research interests. Typically, minor fields require the completion of three doctoral courses (9 credit hours), although some minors require additional credit hours. Additionally, the department granting the minor may require a student to pass competency requirements as part of fulfilling the minor. Students must gain approval of the minor granting department and the student's PGC prior to beginning minor coursework.

Development of Research Competency

To support the LDP's and OSMDP's dedication to research, students must develop and demonstrate competence in research methods and the ability to complete independent research. As such, students take a series of four courses (12 credit hours) focused on developing research competency. Three of the four courses are mandatory and students have the choice on the fourth course of pursuing either an analytical research or an empirical research course.

Additionally, the university requires that students register for research credits over the course of their program and, in particular, during the time students are working on their dissertation. These credits, referred to as dissertation research, are given the course number SCM 999.

Competency in Economics and/or Behavioral Analysis

Students are required by the Eli Broad Graduate School of Management to achieve competence in economic and/or behavioral analysis by completing graduate level course work in these areas. This requirement can be satisfied by taking two 800 or 900 level courses in Economics, Sociology, Psychology, or another core discipline as approved by the PGC.

Competency in Business Concepts

Students are required by the Eli Broad Graduate School of Management to know and be able to apply certain concepts, tools and techniques of business practice. This requirement is automatically fulfilled by students who enter the doctoral program with a Masters of Business Administration (MBA) or an undergraduate business degree from an institution accredited by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB).

Students without such background must complete appropriate coursework. The LDP Committee or OSMDP Committee has discretion in prescribing a sequence of course work to be completed by the student within the first eighteen months of matriculating into the program. This additional course work is meant to serve as reasonable foundation background to help students prepare for program success and are likely to include the following:

- a. **Statistics and Economics Requirements:** This can be addressed by completing EC 420 Introduction to Econometric Methods and STT 421 Statistics I. These are three-credit courses.
- b. **Business Concepts:** This can be addressed by completing the following on-line courses in Finance (FI 805), Accounting (ACC 804), Management (MGT 875) and Marketing (MSC 884). These are two-credit courses. Note: other on-line certification courses may also be considered in consultation with the LDPC or OSMDPC.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR LOGISTICS PROGRAM

Twelve (12) credits of Logistics Major Courses as follows:

- SCM 930 – Theory of Logistics Systems (required)
- SCM 931 – Simulation Methods (required)
- SCM 932 – Logistics and Public Policy (required)
- SCM 918 – Purchasing Seminar
- or* SCM 921 – Inventory Seminar
- or* SCM 990 – Independent Study
- or* other course approved by the student's PGC.

Nine (9) Credits of Minor Courses

Twelve (12) Credits of Methods Courses as follows:

- MGT 914 – Applied Regression Models
- MKT 907 – Causal Modeling in Marketing

SCM 990B – Statistical Research Methods
MGT 906 – Seminar in Organizational Research Methods (behavioral/relationship research focused track);
or SCM 990A – Analytical Research Modeling (analytical research focused track)

Six (6) Credits of economics, econometrics, strategy, or other areas.

- a. EC 801, 810, 818, 820B, 823, etc.
- b. Other selected courses as approved by the student's PGC

Total of 39 credit hours required for seminars

Total of 24 research (SCM 999) credit hours required

Note: Per college requirements, to be in good standing each student must attain at least a 3.25 (out of 4.0) cumulative grade point average by the end of the second full semester of enrollment and thereafter.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR OPERATIONS AND SOURCING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Twelve (12) credits of Operations and Sourcing Management Major Courses as follows:

SCM 920 – Manufacturing Strategy
SCM 921 – Inventory Management
SCM 923 – Research Seminar in Operations Management
SCM 918 – Purchasing Seminar or other course approved by student's PGC

Nine (9) Credits of Minor Courses as prescribed by the student's PGC

Twelve (12) Credits of Methods Courses as follows:

MGT 914 – Applied Regression Models
MKT 907 – Causal Modeling in Marketing
SCM 990A – Analytical Research Modeling
SCM 990B – Statistical Research Methods

Six (6) Credits of economics, econometrics, strategy, or other areas.

- a. EC 801, 810, 818, 820B, 823, etc.
- b. Other selected courses as approved by the student's PGC

Total of 39 credit hours required for seminars

Total of 24 research (SCM 999) credit hours required

Note: Per college requirements, to be in good standing each student must attain at least a 3.25 (out of 4.0) cumulative grade point average by the end of the second full semester of enrollment and thereafter.

SECOND YEAR RESEARCH PAPER

Publications are highly desirable for all doctoral students. Publications enhance the visibility of MSU and the LDP and the OSMDP, help ensure that students will be placed in first-rate academic positions, and involve all department members in the same central research process. Often, class papers and projects can form the basis for starting the publication process.

Students are strongly encouraged to complete a research project before they sit for their comprehensive examination. This paper is normally completed by the end of the second summer in the program. The paper should be written under the supervision of a logistics or operations management faculty member.

This paper provides an opportunity for students to work on a research project in collaboration with faculty. It also provides the basis for what may eventually become a dissertation project. Thus, students are encouraged (but not required) to enroll in SCM 999 (Dissertation research) during the summer while they are working on this paper.

A typical second year paper should involve data collection and analysis or the creation and evaluation of an innovative model. Students are encouraged to “aim high” and plan projects that could, in principle, be presented at a conference or published in a journal, but external presentation or publication is not a requirement for successful completion and faculty approval.

If the project involves collecting data from human research subjects, students are responsible for obtaining prior approval from the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS). Guidelines are available at <http://www.humanresearch.msu.edu/>.

THE LOGISTICS FIELD EXAMINATION

These guidelines are designed to be consistent with and subject to University Graduate School guidelines for doctoral field exams.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF LOGISTICS FIELD EXAM

The purpose of the examination is to ensure that students advancing to PhD. candidate status have sufficient knowledge and mastery of the logistics body of knowledge and scholarly methods to enable them to pursue high quality, independent dissertation research. As such, the field exam provides a mechanism for ensuring that a student who passes the exam is able to:

1. Integrate diverse streams of theory and thought in the field;
2. Respond to questions with sound logic (organized thought) and theoretical reasoning, convincingly expressing a point of view in writing, as would be expected from scholars in the field;
3. Present literature to support their arguments/logic processes, demonstrating familiarity with seminal writings on the topic; and
4. Demonstrate the use of methods of research scholarship necessary for the generation of new knowledge.

The logistics field examination is taken by each student upon completion of the logistics major courses and the methods courses. It is expected, though not required, that a second year research paper be successfully completed before taking the exam. Generally, students will take the exam during their 3rd year with the recommendation that the exam should be completed by the end of the 4th year. Per University Policy as shown in the Academic Programs Manual, comprehensive exams must be passed within 5 years from the time a student first begins doctoral courses.

The exam is scheduled in consultation with the Department Chairperson based on the status of the students needing to sit for the exam. It consists of two written parts (each is four hours in length), usually scheduled as a morning and afternoon session on one day. Based on the results of the written portion of the exam, an oral exam may also be required. Other specifics pertaining to the comprehensive exam are described below.

STRUCTURE OF THE EXAMINATION

1. In the first four-hour session, students will answer a series of research-oriented questions where they will be expected to demonstrate mastery of logistics theory, logistics research, and logistics application in relation to current business issues and environments. Students will be given options to choose among alternative questions. However, there may be one question that students are required to answer.
2. In the second four-hour session, students will answer questions focused on research methodology and research design. Student may be required to conduct a detailed critique of a manuscript from a high-impact journal. If the manuscript critique is required, students will be given notice and examination protocol no later than two weeks prior to the scheduled examination.
3. The oral examination provides an opportunity for faculty to discuss the results of the written exam, ask additional questions of clarification, and provide feedback to the student. It may be required for students failing one or more questions on the written examination.

TIMING AND PREPARATION FOR THE EXAM

Generally, the logistics exam is scheduled for the Fall semester. Students wishing to take the Logistics field exam must request, in writing to the Department Chairperson, that the exam be scheduled. The request must occur at least three months in advance of the desired examination date. The Department Chairperson will verify student eligibility for the exam. The examination will be coordinated by a logistics faculty member designated by the Department Chairperson. All regular logistics faculty members have the opportunity to contribute potential exam questions as well as participate in exam grading.

The exam is scheduled in consultation with the Department Chairperson based on the status of the students needing to sit for the exam. If a student fails the field exam, an exam may also be offered in the following semester, at the student's written request. The approximate date of a

field exam is set at least two-three months in advance, and a final date is established at least four weeks in advance.

Students are encouraged to consult previous exam questions, available in the Supply Chain Management Department office, prior to taking the exam. Students should also consult with logistics faculty members; especially those who have taught the core courses, prior to the time the students begin preparing for the exam. Finally, other students who have passed comprehensive exams are an additional source of valuable information. Strategies for studying and writing answers, especially helpful papers and books, and so on, are available if students pursue them.

The comprehensive exam is not a "big final" that covers only material encountered in core classes. Students studying for comprehensives are expected to be quite knowledgeable with respect to the history and traditions, controversies and accomplishments, theories and applications, methods and principles, as well as significant books and papers in the examination fields.

GRADING

Each question will be graded by two faculty who are selected jointly by the Department Chairperson and the coordinator of the comprehensive exam.

1. Students must achieve an overall average score of 85 percent to achieve a passing grade on the exam. Each question is weighted the same in computing the section average.
2. If a student fails to achieve a passing grade on a section, he or she will be required to retake that section. In other words, if a student fails one part, they retake that part. If a student fails both parts, they retake both parts.
3. If a student fails the exam on the first try, he or she may retake the exam once. A student has 12 months to retake and pass the exam. If a student does not pass the exam and does not or cannot take the exam again, he or she will be unable to complete the requirements for a Ph.D. Generally, the student will be terminated from the program at the end of the semester in which the exam was last taken. Exceptions to this may be considered with the approval of the regular logistics faculty.
4. Faculty grade, individually, the examination items without student names attached to them using the scale shown in Appendix B. Each question is graded by two Faculty members. The absence of names associated with responses makes students' identities less salient in grading. Although, given the small numbers of persons taking the exam, this does not assure anonymity. The Chairperson in conjunction with the Logistics Doctoral Program Director assigns each question to two logistics faculty based on the expertise required. The results of each faculty grade are given to the chairperson's administrative assistant who summarizes the results and provides them for review by the exam coordinator, Logistics Doctoral Program Director, and the Department Chairperson.

5. When individual grading is complete, the logistics faculty may meet to discuss evaluations of responses to items and reach a consensus grade for each item completed by a student.

THE OPERATIONS AND SOURCING MANAGEMENT FIELD EXAMINATION

These guidelines are designed to be consistent with and subject to University Graduate School guidelines for doctoral field exams.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF OSM FIELD EXAM

The purpose of the examination is to ensure that persons advancing to PhD. candidate status have sufficient knowledge and facility with the OSM body of knowledge and scholarly methods to enable them to pursue high quality, independent dissertation research. As such, the field exam provides a mechanism for ensuring that a student who passes the exam is able to:

1. Integrate diverse streams of theory and thought in the field;
2. Respond to questions with sound logic (organized thought) and theoretical reasoning, convincingly expressing a point of view in writing, as would be expected from scholars in the field;
3. Present literature to support their arguments/logic processes, demonstrating familiarity with seminal writings on the topic; and
4. Demonstrate the use of methods of research scholarship necessary for the generation of new knowledge.

STUDENT ELIGIBILITY AND TIME LIMIT

Doctoral students are eligible to take the exam after completing and receiving a grade of at least 3.0 for each of their required major and methods courses. Exams typically take place during the third year of a student's program. University guidelines stipulate that a student must pass the comprehensive exam within five years of his/her enrollment into the doctoral program. All degree requirements must be completed within eight years of enrollment. Students who extend their stay beyond eight years are required to re-take the comprehensive field exam.

CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF THE OSM FIELD EXAM

The OSM field exam covers the body of knowledge regarding both research content and methodology in Operations and Supply Management. Because the areas and methods of research in OSM are quite broad, faculty will provide some guidance to the students as they prepare for the exam. Thus, the content of OSM field exams is largely governed by two domains. First, a readings list maintained by the doctoral committee chair identifies important publications in various research areas. Second, heavy emphasis is given to the content covered in the OSM major courses. Students are expected to make use of these two sources to focus their exam preparation.

The field exam contains questions addressing OSM theory and related research content, and questions addressing research design and methodologies. Students may be given options to

choose among certain alternative questions at the discretion of the examining committee, while answers to certain questions may be required.

The structure of the exam may be changed at the OSM faculty's discretion. However, advanced notice of significant changes in the structure will be communicated to students in writing at least four weeks in advance of the exam date.

The exam is given over two test periods on two successive days, typically covering content related questions on the first day and methodology related questions on the second day.

The exam is to be administered under "in-class" conditions. Students are not allowed to bring any outside materials or references to the examination or to discuss the examination with anyone during the examination period. Exam responses are hand written.

The department secretary assigns a unique identifier (e.g., number) to each student in order to provide anonymity of the student's responses. Original answers are kept on file for at least two years. The secretary makes a separate copy of the student's answers for each member of the exam committee for grading purposes.

TIMING AND PREPARATION FOR THE EXAM

The exam is scheduled in consultation with the Department Chairperson based on the status of the students needing to sit for the exam. The OSM field exam is offered once a year, in the Fall semester, unless there are no eligible students requiring the exam. Alternatively, an exam may be offered in the Spring if the OSM faculty indicate that it is warranted by majority vote. If a student fails the field exam, an exam may also be offered in the following semester, at the student's written request.

The approximate date of a field exam is set at least three months in advance, and a final date is established at least four weeks in advance. Students who wish to take the OSM field exam must notify (in writing) the Department Chair of their intent before the end of the prior Spring semester. The Department Chair will verify the student's eligibility for the exam.

The OSM doctoral committee chairperson acts as the exam coordinator, or appoints a coordinator. If the committee chairperson is unable to serve, the Department Chair appoints an alternative coordinator. The exam coordinator requests each OSM faculty who taught a required doctoral student seminar to which the students have been exposed to write an exam question. Other faculty may also be invited by the doctoral committee to write questions, thus establishing an exam writing committee. The exam writing committee must be established at least three weeks in advance of the exam. In order to allow time for revisions and preparation of the final version of the exam, each faculty member must submit his or her exam question(s) at least two weeks before the exam date. In the following week, all members of the exam writing committee must be given the opportunity to read all of the exam questions and to suggest revisions to the exam coordinator. All suggested revisions must be submitted at least one week prior to the exam date.

EXAM GRADING PROCESS

Final scores for the exam are tabulated and communicated to the students within one month of the exam date.

Each of the exam questions are graded separately and given equal weight. Exam responses for a given question are reviewed and scored by the faculty member who wrote the question and a second member of the exam writing team. Table 1 illustrates the grading scheme.

TABLE 1
OSM FIELD EXAM GRADING SCHEME

Grade	Interpretation	Comments
4.0	High Pass	The candidate's answer meets and exceeds the minimum requirements. The candidate demonstrates an ability to draw on the relevant literature and to build and extend on this literature. New and innovative insights are offered. The answer demonstrates mastery of the material at the highest level.
3.0	Pass	The candidate's answer meets and exceeds the minimum requirements. The candidate demonstrates an ability to draw on the relevant literature and to build and extend on this literature. The answer demonstrates acceptable mastery of the material.
2.0	Fail	The candidate's response fails to meet the minimum requirements for the question. The candidate provides literature without adequate interpretation. The candidate is unable to extend the material in ways expected of a doctoral student.
1.0	Fail	The candidate's response fails to satisfy the requirements. The question asked is not the one answered. Material is provided without adequate integration. The candidate has not demonstrated simple knowledge of the material and its application.

If, for a given question, there is more than a 1.0 grade difference between graders, then the graders discuss the rationale for the differences and mutually agree on a final grade. If agreement can not be reached, then the exam committee chairperson assigns an additional faculty member to grade the question. The majority grade is used as the final grade for the student for that question.

The exam coordinator uses the following schedule to determine the overall exam grade for each student. Table 2 characterizes the OSM field exam results interpretation.

TABLE 2
OSM FIELD EXAM RESULTS INTERPRETATION

Average of all scores	Interpretation	Conditions
3.25 or higher	High Pass	No question grade below 3.0
2.75 – 3.25	Pass	No question grade less than or equal to 2.0.
2.3 – 2.75	Continuation possible	Only one failing grade allowed per section.
<2.3	Failure	

Any examination continuance, either oral or written, will be given and evaluated by the examination committee. The continuance must be completed within two months of the original exam date.

Once the overall grade has been established for each student, the final disposition of the student is determined by a meeting of the examination committee, in which all the grades are reviewed. In this meeting, the faculty also determine the feedback that should be given to the student. The exam committee chair communicates the results and feedback to the department chair, who communicates the results in writing to the student.

THE DISSERTATION

The Ph.D. dissertation is the capstone of the doctoral education program. When completed it signifies individual competence as a researcher, and, as a public document, it represents the researcher to professional peers. Dissertation projects take many different forms. Some are based on a single large study, while others consist of a group of smaller, related projects. The dissertation must be original, empirical research that makes a significant contribution to theory. The goal is to generate publishable results to launch the student on a successful academic career.

THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

The dissertation process is supervised by a dissertation committee composed of at least **four** members, one of whom is designated, chairperson. The dissertation chairperson must be a tenured faculty member. The student's LDPC or OSMDPC must approve the Dissertation committee. There may be overlap between members of the PGC and the dissertation committee, but this is not required. Students should form a dissertation committee by the end of their 3rd year.

Selection of a dissertation chairperson involves considering the mutual research interests of the student and faculty member. Thus, it is important for each student to develop concise awareness of faculty research interests so that the choice of the dissertation chairperson is appropriate. Selecting the remaining faculty members for the committee will be done in consultation with the dissertation chair.

The decision to pass a student's dissertation is the final certification of that student's professional competence. This certification is taken seriously since the quality of the dissertation reflects on the personal credibility of individual committee members as well as the quality of the MSU Supply Chain Management Program.

DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEFENSE

The first step in the dissertation process involves the development of a research proposal regarding the topic that a student intends to examine and the method that he or she will use to examine it. The development of this proposal typically involves intensive interaction between the student and his or her dissertation committee. When committee members are generally satisfied with a student's proposal, an oral defense is scheduled. The oral defense requires the student to defend the dissertation proposal in an open meeting. All of the members of the students' dissertation committee should be in attendance at the oral defense. The date, time, and place for the defense of the dissertation proposal must be announced to the Broad School faculty ten days in advance of the event by informing the Broad School's Associate Dean of Research.

Since the purpose of the oral defense is to provide faculty input to guide the dissertation research, the oral defense must be completed before the majority of the research effort is undertaken. Additionally, all course work (except for dissertation research credits) must be completed with grades reported before the student is permitted to defend the dissertation proposal.

In a closed session following the defense, the committee formally votes to determine whether the student will be allowed to proceed with the dissertation research. A successful defense of the dissertation proposal is achieved when three-fourths of the student's dissertation committee, including the dissertation chairperson, approves the defense. The dissertation committee will report the successful completion of this requirement to the Graduate School.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS (UCRIHS)

When human subjects are involved in the dissertation research (or any research), students are responsible for obtaining prior approval for their dissertation research from the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS). This approval is generally required any time human research subjects are involved in data collection (including surveys, interviews, experiments, etc.) and must be obtained *before* data collection begins. Guidelines are available at <http://www.humanresearch.msu.edu/>.

FINAL DISSERTATION PRESENTATION

The final oral presentation defense of the completed dissertation occurs in an open meeting when the student's dissertation committee agrees that he/she has completed an acceptable independent research project and written it up satisfactorily.

Similar to the proposal defense, all of the members of the students' dissertation committee must be in attendance at the final dissertation defense. The date, time, and place for the defense of the

dissertation proposal must be announced to the Broad School faculty ten days in advance of the event by informing the Broad School's Associate Dean of Research.

In a closed session following the presentation, the committee formally votes to determine whether the student has completed the dissertation research. A successful final defense of the dissertation is achieved when the student's dissertation committee deems the dissertation acceptable. The dissertation committee will report the successful completion of this requirement to the Graduate School.

Specific policies for the conduct of the oral defense of dissertations, the format of the dissertation, dates for submissions of the final dissertation and other procedures must conform to the Graduate School's specifications. Students should consult a current copy of the Graduate School's requirements (i.e., **The Graduate School Guide to the Preparation of Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations**, available on-line and from the Office of The Graduate School) when preparing the final dissertation and the dissertation defense.

The dissertation must be successfully completed within eight years from the time a student first begins doctoral courses. Students may apply for extensions of the eight-year period to the department, Dean of the Business College, and Dean of the Graduate School as outlined in the Academic Programs Manual (see Doctoral Programs – Time Limit). If the extension is approved, comprehensive exams must be passed again.

DISSERTATION PROJECT: A WORD OF CAUTION

Students often underestimate the time required to form an idea for a dissertation, prepare a proposal, conduct the research and defend it. The average time is two years. For example, the dissertation proposal may require three to six months to draft, then another three to six months to refine and acquire committee acceptance. Advanced notice is required to schedule a proposal defense. Dissertation research and writing usually takes about a year, although additional time is sometimes needed. Another month or two should be allowed for revisions required by final committee recommendations made prior to the defense. Scheduling the defense requires advanced notice. Final editorial revisions required after a successful presentation may take another month or two. In sum, it is unrealistic to expect to complete the entire dissertation process, from proposal draft to accepted dissertation, in less than eighteen months. Consequently, a draft of the proposal should be under initial committee review no later than six to ten months after passing the comprehensive examination.

EXAMPLE TIMETABLE FOR PROGRAM COMPLETION

The following timetable illustrates a typical course sequence. Students should consult university course schedules to determine when courses will be offered. The exact schedule will vary depending on faculty availability. It is highly recommended that students take the Major and Methods Courses as soon as possible within their schedule. Table 3 illustrates a typical timetable by year and semester. Note: funding is generally guaranteed for a four year period only.

**TABLE 3
TYPICAL COURSE SCHEDULE BY YEAR AND SEMESTER**

	Fall	Spring	Summer
Year 1	Major/minor/research courses	Major/minor/research courses	Start research paper (SCM 999)
Year 2	Major/minor/research courses	Major/minor/research courses	Finish research paper (SCM 999)
Year 3	Comp Exam Major/minor/research courses	Research (SCM 999)	Proposal defense
Year 4	Research (SCM 999)	Research (SCM 999)	Dissertation defense

CHECKLIST AND DEADLINES

Table 4 outlines the normal completion dates and deadlines for key milestones in the doctoral program.

**TABLE 4
TYPICAL DOCTORAL PROGRAM MILESTONES**

Program Element	Normal Completion	Deadline
Meet with the LDPC or OSMDPC	During orientation	1-2 weeks of arrival
Select the PGC	During the first semester	End of first semester
Report of the Guidance Committee approved	End of first semester	End of first year, but can be revised at any time
Coursework	Within 4-5 semesters	Within 5 years of beginning doctoral courses
Comprehensive Exams	Fall of 3 rd year	Within 5 years of beginning doctoral courses
Select dissertation chair and committee	Fall of 3 rd year	Within 5 years of beginning doctoral courses
Dissertation proposal	Summer of 3 rd year	Summer of 5 th year
Dissertation defense	Summer of 4 th year	Within 8 years of beginning doctoral courses

GUIDELINES FOR INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Michigan State University and the Eli Broad College of Business uphold the highest standards of ethics in research and scholarship. Students are expected to conform to the University’s Guidelines for Integrity in Research and Creative Activities, which are posted at grad.msu.edu/publications/docs/integrityresearch.pdf. Students may also be interested in the Research Integrity Newsletter, posted at <http://grad.msu.edu/researchintegrity/newsletters.aspx>. An

additional and important source of information is the Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities document found at <https://www.msu.edu/unit/ombud/GSRRfinal.html>. Appendix D, E and F contain additional information concerning academic policies and resources.

CRITERIA FOR DISMISSAL

It is expected that all admitted students have the skills and motivation to successfully earn a Ph.D. and the program is structured to help them do so. Student progress is reviewed every semester to identify potential problems and help students stay on track. Any action for dismissal requires unanimous written approval by the LDPC or OSMDPC respectively with the concurrence of the Department Chairperson.

Criteria for dismissal includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- 1. Failure to remain in good academic standing can result in dismissal.** Students are expected to maintain the required minimum grade point average.
- 2. Failure to pass comprehensive exams as previously discussed will result in dismissal.**
- 3. Failure to make satisfactory progress towards a dissertation may result in dismissal.**
- 4. Violations of academic integrity or other university policies can be grounds for dismissal.** Throughout all stages of their career at MSU, the highest level of academic integrity in scholarship and research is expected.

FACULTY EXPECTATIONS FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS

Faculty may invite speakers to MSU for faculty/student colloquia or job interviews. It is expected that doctoral students attend these guest presentations and related events. Expectation regarding student attendance is based on the belief that students should take advantage of every opportunity to learn about other researchers currently in the field.

Students are expected to attend other informal (i.e. brownbag) colloquia for Supply Chain Management Department faculty and students. These meetings provide students the opportunity to sharpen presentation skills and practice critical inquiry in a supportive atmosphere.

Students are strongly encouraged to attend logistics and operations and sourcing management dissertation defense presentations. In this way, students become familiar with the nature of dissertations as well as the process through which dissertations are completed.

Students are encouraged to obtain funds intended specifically for graduate students (e.g., summer research grants; publishers' awards; NSF grants) for their dissertation research. Learning how to identify sources of support and write proposals is encouraged.

The student's assistantship and degree program is expected to be a full-time commitment. Outside work for pay is considered an impediment to academic progress and must be approved by the Department Chair.

Students are encouraged to attend national and professional conferences. National meetings of professional organizations (e.g., Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals, Decision Sciences Institute, Production and Operations Management Society, Institute for Operations Research and Management Science, Academy of Management, Academy of International Business, Institute of Supply Management) enable students to meet noted scholars, and provide job placement opportunities that can be especially useful to students when they enter the academic job market. Subject to the availability of funds, the program will attempt to support travel for these activities on a limited basis.

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES IN MENTORING AND GUIDANCE

Faculty members are responsible for providing guidance and mentoring students. In the LDP and OSMDP, the goal is to keep the program small so that faculty can work closely with each student. The role of the faculty advisor is described in MSU's Guidelines for Graduate Student Advising and Mentoring Relationships (<http://grad.msu.edu/publications/docs/studentadvising.pdf>).

FEEDBACK TO DOCTORAL STUDENTS

Doctoral students receive periodic feedback regarding their progress the program. The purpose of this feedback is to help each student develop to his or her greatest potential. For first year students, there will be a scheduled informal session held at the beginning of the Spring semester with the LDPC or OSMDPC or guidance committee (as appropriate). A second, formal evaluation and feedback session is held near the end of the Spring semester. Thereafter, there is one formal annual session near the end of each Spring semester with the understanding that there may be unscheduled informal feedback throughout the year. These sessions are intended to provide developmental as well as evaluative feedback. The goal in these sessions is to make sure that students stay on track for successful completion of the program, in accordance with their career objectives. Thus, feedback is developmental as well as evaluative.

1. The LDPC and OSMDPC Committees will use the student's Student Activity Report (SAR) to:
 - a. Review the student's speed and quality of progress in detail. This evaluation is based on the student's research performance, class work, teaching performance, and research preparedness. Based on the program and college requirements, a written progress evaluation document (see Appendix C) is provided to summarize this review. A copy of this document is provided to the student and in the student's departmental file. Optionally, the student may also place a written response to this progress evaluation in the departmental file.
 - b. Collaboratively set behavioral goals with the student for the coming evaluation period. The student may record and place a copy of these goals in his or her departmental file.

2. The Associate Dean for Research in the Eli Broad College maintains a Doctoral Program Information System. Each spring, doctoral students will use this system to enter their latest accomplishments, activities, special projects, current activities, etc. into the SAR System. Starting with the second year, students are required to begin writing professional vitae and submit them as part of their evaluation documents. It is only accessible during the announced reporting period, and can be accessed via the URL <http://www.bus.msu.edu/staff/admin/index.cfm>. Specific details on using the system will be communicated by the Doctoral Program Director as necessary.

REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS IN ACADEMIC FILES

Students can access their academic records by making a request to the Department Chair. If there is an error, the Chair assists the student in researching and resolving the problem. While unusual, typical errors include grades that have been recorded incorrectly; credits that have been transferred or assigned incorrectly, etc. The Chair will work with the student to ensure the speedy resolution of such problems.

TEACHING ELIGIBILITY AND REQUIREMENTS

The Graduate Employees Union has entered into a collective bargaining agreement with Michigan State University. This agreement provides a broad range of rights and responsibilities, and is renegotiated periodically. The terms of this agreement are available at: <http://grad.msu.edu/forms/docs/gaapp.pdf>.

Before students can serve in any teaching capacity, they must complete MSU's TA Orientation program. For information on TA resources available and Orientation workshops, please see <http://tap.msu.edu/>. Students whose first language is not English must also pass the SPEAK test and attend MSU's International Teaching Assistant program. For more information for international TAs, please see the following: <http://tap.msu.edu/ita/english testing.aspx>.

Before students can teach a course on their own, they may have been a TA for a discussion section of that course and been evaluated by the professor responsible for the course as ready to teach a section on their own.

When assigned as a discussion section TA, students' teaching performance is evaluated each semester by the professor responsible for the course. When assigned to teach a course on their own, the Department Chairperson will be responsible for evaluating students' teaching performance for each course taught. Renewal of a graduate teaching assistantship is conditional upon receiving a satisfactory evaluation with respect to current and prior graduate teaching assistantship assignments. Students must also be making satisfactory progress in their degree program, as determined by the annual evaluation.

Exceptions to the above teaching policies can be made at discretion of the Department Chairperson responsible for staffing the course.

A Graduate assistant appointed as a TA will be moved to a Level 3 after they have been employed in the department as a TA for 6 semesters (7th semester as a TA will be at Level 3).

CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION TO DOCTORAL CONSORTIA

Special sessions are conducted for outstanding students at national conferences. The purpose of these sessions is to acquaint students, on a first-hand basis, with newly emerging ideas being developed by recognized experts in our fields. Criteria for student selection include:

Performance as a Student

1. Course work performance.
2. Steady progress toward degree.
3. Active research involvement.

Career Stage and Interest

1. Being nearly done with coursework (i.e., after 2-3 years).
2. Evidence of student interest in consortium topic.

It is not always the case that students are sent to doctoral consortia by the department each year. The final decision is made by the Logistics or OSM faculty respectively in conjunction with the Department Chairperson and is based upon whether one or more students have met the criteria for attendance. For example, many doctoral consortia require a viable research proposal. An individual may be invited to participate in one consortium one year and another in another year. However, no one is sent to the same consortium twice.

All of these criteria are subject to budgetary constraints.

THE FACULTY

The faculty of the LDP and OSMDP have diverse research interests which, when supplemented by the interests of other faculty on campus, provide students with an unusually broad educational opportunity. The core faculty consist of those individuals whose teaching and research responsibilities are primarily in one of the Supply Chain Management programs. Please visit their web sites at <http://www.bus.msu.edu/supplychain/faculty.cfm> for more information.

LIST OF APPENDICES

- A. Report of the Faculty Advisor Form -- Doctoral Program**
- B. Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria**
- C. Student Progress Evaluation Form**
- D. Academic Policies**
- E. University Resources**
- F. Code of Teaching Responsibility**

APPENDIX A

Report of the Faculty Advisor Form -- Doctoral Program

APPENDIX B

Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria

60	70	80	85	95	100
<p>Misses most important points</p> <p>Response painfully padded with details.</p>	<p>Obviously unfamiliar with area content.</p> <p>Student does not adequately know the material.</p> <p>Misses many important points.</p> <p>Did not understand the question or the topic.</p> <p>Lack of acquaintance with the literature.</p> <p>Did not attempt to plan or organize.</p> <p>Little or no comprehension of what constitutes relevant information.</p>	<p>Omitted several important references.</p> <p>No evidence of integration of material.</p> <p>Shows considerable tendency to stray from the point.</p> <p>Organization is weak.</p> <p>Poorly integrated in terms of overall structure.</p> <p>Answer is full of the obvious.</p> <p>Shows a sketchy acquaintance with the up-to-date studies</p> <p>Answered from a parochial point of view.</p>	<p>Shows some attempt at organization.</p> <p>Answered the question or problem posed.</p> <p>Sticks to the topic.</p> <p>Answer to be expected from someone with a general exposure to the material.</p> <p>Evidence clearly presented but not the most germane to the point.</p>	<p>The included material was well expressed.</p> <p>Cites supporting research to back up points.</p> <p>Most of the research cited.</p> <p>Relevant information with minimum of redundancy.</p> <p>Organization around some theoretical orientation that gives internal and logical cohesion.</p> <p>Shows a grasp of the problem areas.</p> <p>Meaningful interpretation of research results.</p>	<p>Originality in bringing research data from various sources to bear problem.</p> <p>A well organized answer that covers all major points.</p> <p>Organized before writing and supplemented with cited research.</p>

APPENDIX C
LDP and OSMDP
Student Progress Evaluation Form

Student's Name _____ Evaluation for the Year _____

Student's Signature and Date of Receipt _____

Acceptable Marginal	Unacceptable Not Applicable	Dimension and Comments
_____	_____	COURSEWORK
_____	_____	1. Performance in logistics core courses (Years 1-2)
_____	_____	2. Performance in other courses (Years 2-3)
_____	_____	3. Progress toward coursework and examination completion (including minors and business competencies; Years 1-4)
_____	_____	TEACHING
_____	_____	1. 300-level teaching performance (Years 1-4)
_____	_____	2. Ability to teach independently (Years 3-4)
_____	_____	RESEARCH
_____	_____	1. Level of participation in ongoing research (Years 1-4)
_____	_____	2. Performance in logistics Second Year Research Paper (Years 1-3), where applicable
_____	_____	3. Ability to perform independent research (Years 2-4)
_____	_____	OTHER
_____	_____	1. Proposal/dissertation progress (Years 3-5)
_____	_____	2. Attendance at Supply Chain group meetings (brownbags, dissertation proposals and defenses, colloquia; Years 1-4)
_____	_____	3. Timely progress toward degree completion (Years 1-4)

Other comments (performance compared to previous evaluations, professional presentations, preparation for job market, etc.) _____

Appendix D Academic Policies

A. Admission to the Doctoral Program [**Academic Programs Catalog** **<http://www.reg.msu.edu>**]

Applicants for admission must possess a bachelor's degree from a recognized educational institution, a superior academic record, and very strong scores on either the Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT) or the Graduate Record Examination (GRE). Persons admitted must have the qualifications of perseverance and intellectual curiosity, and an interest in scholarly research. Evidence of these qualities is obtained from an appraisal of a statement of purpose submitted by the applicant and letters of recommendation. Admissions decisions are made by a faculty committee in the department of the student's major field of concentration and are reviewed by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

B. Policy on Academic Standards [**Academic Programs Catalog** **<http://www.reg.msu.edu>**]

A record of performance and action consistent with high professional standards is required of every student. To be in good standing, a doctoral student must attain at least a 3.25 cumulative grade-point average by the end of the second semester of full-time enrollment and thereafter or, on the initiative of the department of the student's major field of concentration and with the approval of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, the student will be dismissed from the doctoral program. A comprehensive appraisal of each doctoral student's performance is made annually by a review committee composed of faculty members in the department of the student's major field of concentration. The formal review includes the following areas: performance in course work and on comprehensive examinations, performance in teaching or other duties that might be required of a graduate assistant, participation in department colloquia, and progress toward the completion of degree requirements. As a result of the review and based upon college and department standards, one of the following actions will be taken: (1) the student will remain on regular status in the doctoral program, (2) the student will be placed on probationary status that is conditioned on specific improvements in performance, or (3) the student will be dismissed from the doctoral program. Copies of the results of the yearly appraisal are provided to the student, the student's Doctoral Program Director, the Departmental Chairperson, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

C. Policy on Academic Integrity [**Source: The College's "Policy on Academic Integrity"**]

The principles of truth and honesty are fundamental to the educational process and the academic integrity of the University. Therefore, no student shall:

1. Claim or submit the academic work of another, as one's own.
2. Procure, provide, accept or use any materials containing questions or answers to any examination or assignment without proper authorization.
3. Complete or attempt to complete any assignment or examination for another individual without proper authorization.

4. Allow any examination or assignment to be completed for oneself, in part or in total, by another without proper authorization.
5. Alter, tamper with, appropriate, destroy or otherwise interfere with the research resources or other academic work of another person.
6. Fabricate or falsify data or results.

D. Conflict Resolution [CoB “Hearing Procedure for Student Academic Complaints”]

In accordance with the provisions of Michigan State University’s Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR), The Eli Broad College of Business and Graduate School of Management has established a procedure for the receipt and consideration of student academic complaints. Your doctoral program director or coordinator can provide you with the current version of the procedure.

E. Work-Related Policies

Most doctoral students in the College receive a graduate assistantship, with duties that may include teaching or research performed under the supervision of a faculty member. Graduate assistants are expected to fulfill their assigned responsibilities at a high level of performance. For more information regarding the rights and responsibilities of graduate students at MSU, refer to “Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities” [www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/]. The performance of graduate assistants involved in teaching is formally evaluated at least once per year. Teaching assistants also are governed by the agreement between the University and the Graduate Employees Union [www.msu.edu/user/gradschl/geu/agree.pdf]. Information on health insurance options for MSU students is available from Human Resources [<http://www.hr.msu.edu>]. International students are required to take an English-language proficiency test administered by the English Language Center [elc.msu.edu/], which also offers language instruction to teaching assistants and others seeking to improve their fluency.

Appendix E University Resources

A. Equal Opportunity, Non-Discrimination & Affirmative Action

Michigan State University is committed to the principles of equal opportunity, non-discrimination, and affirmative action. University programs, activities, and facilities are available to all without regard to race, color, sex, religion, creed, national origin, political persuasion, sexual preference, marital status, handicap, or age. The University is an affirmative action, equal-opportunity employer.

B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

For information about your academic rights and responsibilities as a graduate student, refer to the Graduate Student Handbook [www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/index.htm].

C. Library Resources

The MSU Libraries have a growing collection of over three million volumes and access to a large collection of electronic resources including full text databases and indexes to journal articles. The William C. Gast Business library provides services for the MSU College of Business. Students may call Gast Business Library reference librarians to help plan research strategies. They will consult via telephone or e-mail. If you go to the Business Library, call beforehand to make an appointment with a librarian, so they can better assist you.

D. Useful Contacts

Websites

The Graduate School	http://grad.msu.edu/
Graduate Student Handbook	www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/index.htm
Human Resources	http://www.hr.msu.edu/
including MSU policies on: Doctoral Program Guidance Committee, composition The Code of Teaching Responsibility Health Care Coverage Employee Handbook	
Graduate Employees Union contract	www.msu.edu/user/gradschl/geu/agree.pdf
The Eli Broad College of Business	www.bus.msu.edu/
Academic Programs - Graduate Study	www.reg.msu.edu/UCC/AcademicPrograms.asp
MSU Library	www.lib.msu.edu/
University Ombudsman	https://www.msu.edu/unit/ombud/

Appendix F Code of Teaching Responsibility

(<http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/codeofteaching.htm>)

This policy was approved by the Academic Council on November 4, 1969 and the Academic Senate on November 19, 1969; it was subsequently revised by Academic Council on May 19, 1976, February 27, 1996, and April 19, 2005 (effective Fall semester 2005).

Satisfaction of teaching responsibilities by instructional staff members (herein referred to as instructors) is essential to the successful functioning of a university. This University conceives these responsibilities to be so important that performance by instructors in meeting the provisions of this Code shall be taken into consideration in determining salary increases, tenure, and promotion.

1. **Course content:** Instructors shall be responsible for ensuring that the content of the courses they teach is consistent with the course descriptions approved by the University Committee on Curriculum and the Academic Council. Instructors shall direct class activities toward the fulfillment of course objectives and shall evaluate student performance in a manner consistent with these objectives.
2. **Course syllabi:** Instructors shall be responsible for distributing a course syllabus (either in print or electronic form) at the beginning of the semester. The syllabus shall minimally include:
 - instructional objectives;
 - instructor contact information and office hours;
 - grading criteria and methods used to determine final course grades;
 - date of the final examination and tentative dates of required assignments, quizzes, and tests, if applicable;
 - attendance policy, if different from the University attendance policy and especially when that attendance policy affects student grades; and
 - required and recommended course materials to be purchased, including textbooks and supplies.
3. **Student Assessment and Final Grades:** Instructors shall be responsible for informing students, in a timely manner so as to enhance learning, of the grading criteria and methods used to determine grades on individual assignments. Instructors shall be responsible for assessing a student's performance based on announced criteria and on standards of academic achievement. Instructors shall submit final course grades in accordance with University deadlines.
4. **Testing Documents:** Instructors shall be responsible for returning to students student answers to quizzes, tests, and examinations with such promptness to enhance the learning experience. Instructors shall retain final examination answers for at least one semester to allow students to review or to retrieve them. All testing questions (whether on quizzes, tests, or mid-semester or final examinations) are an integral part of course materials, and the decision whether to allow students to retain them is left to the discretion of the instructor.
5. **Term Papers and Comparable Projects:** Instructors shall be responsible for returning to students student term papers and other comparable projects with sufficient promptness to enhance the learning experience. Term papers and other comparable projects are the property of students who prepare them. Instructors shall retain such unclaimed course work for at least one semester to allow students to retrieve such work. Instructors have a right to retain a copy of student course work for their own files.

6. **Class Meetings:** Instructors shall be responsible for meeting their classes regularly and at scheduled times. To allow units to take appropriate action, instructors shall notify their units if they are to be absent and have not made suitable arrangements regarding their classes.
7. **Applicability of the Code of Teaching Responsibility to Student Assistants:** Instructors of courses in which assistants are authorized to perform teaching, grading, or other instructional functions shall be responsible for acquainting such individuals with the provisions of this Code and for monitoring their compliance.
8. **Instructor Accessibility to Students:** Instructors shall be responsible for being accessible to students outside of class time and therefore shall schedule and keep office hours for student conferences. Office hours should be scheduled at times convenient to both students and instructors with the additional option of mutually convenient prearranged appointments for students whose schedules conflict with announced office hours. Each teaching unit shall determine the minimum number of office hours for instructors in that unit. Instructors who serve as academic advisors also shall be responsible for maintaining appropriate office hours before and during enrollment periods. In addition to office hours, instructor accessibility through e-mail and other means is encouraged.
9. **Commercialization of Course Notes and Materials:** The University prohibits students from commercializing their notes of lectures and University-provided class materials *without the written consent of the instructor*. Instructors may allow commercialization by including permission in the course syllabus or other written statement distributed to all students in the class.

Hearing Procedures

1. Students may register complaints regarding an instructor's failure to comply with the provisions of the *Code of Teaching Responsibility* directly with that instructor.
2. Students may also take complaints directly to teaching units' chief administrators or their designates. If those persons are unable to resolve matters to the student's satisfaction, they are obligated to transmit written complaints to unit committees charged with hearing such complaints. A copy of any complaint transmitted shall be sent to the instructor. A written report of the action or recommendation of such groups will be forwarded to the student and to the instructor, normally within ten working days of the receipt of the complaint.
3. Complaints coming to the University [Ombudsman](#) will be reported, in writing, to chief administrators of the teaching units involved when in the Ombudsman's opinion a hearing appears necessary. It will be the responsibility of chief administrators or their designates to inform the instructor and to refer such unresolved complaints to the unit committees charged with hearing such complaints. A written report of the action or recommendation of such groups will be forwarded to the University Ombudsman, to the student, and to the instructor, normally within ten working days of the receipt of the complaint.
4. Students wishing to appeal a teaching unit action or recommendation may do so as outlined in [Academic Freedom Report for Students at Michigan State University](#), [Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities](#), or [Medical Student Rights and Responsibilities](#).

Such complaints must normally be initiated no later than the middle of the semester following the one wherein alleged violations occurred. Exceptions shall be made in cases where the involved instructor or student is absent from the University during the semester following the one wherein alleged violations occurred.

Graduate Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures
(<https://www.msu.edu/unit/ombud/grievance-procedures/index.html>)

Graduate Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures

For the Logistics and Operations and Sourcing Management Program

Each right of an individual places a reciprocal duty upon others: the duty to permit the individual to exercise the right. The student, as a member of the academic community, has both rights and duties. Within that community, the student's most essential right is the right to learn. The University has a duty to provide for the student those privileges, opportunities, and protections which best promote the learning process in all its aspects. The student also has duties to other members of the academic community, the most important of which is to refrain from interference with those rights of others which are equally essential to the purposes and processes of the University. (GSRR Article 1.2)

The *Michigan State University Student Rights and Responsibilities (SRR)* and the *Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR)* documents establish the rights and responsibilities of MSU students and prescribe procedures to resolve allegations of violations of those rights through formal grievance hearings. In accordance with the SRR and the GSRR, the **Logistics and Operations and Sourcing Management Program** has established the following Hearing Board procedures for adjudicating graduate student academic grievances and complaints. (See GSRR 5.4.)

I. JURISDICTION OF THE LOGISTICS AND OPERATIONS AND SOURCING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM HEARING BOARD:

- A. The Hearing Board serves as the initial Hearing Board for academic grievance hearings involving graduate students who allege violations of academic rights or seek to contest an allegation of academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards or falsifying admission and academic records). (See GSRR 2.3 and 5.1.1.)
- B. Students may not request an academic grievance hearing based on an allegation of incompetent instruction. (See GSRR 2.2.2)

II. COMPOSITION OF THE HEARING BOARD:

- A. The Program shall constitute a Hearing Board pool no later than the end of the tenth week of the spring semester according to established Program procedures. Hearing Board members serve one year terms with reappointment possible. The Hearing Board pool should include both faculty and graduate students. (See GSRR 5.1.2 and 5.1.6.)
- B. The Chair of the Hearing Board shall be the faculty member with rank who shall vote only in the event of a tie. In addition to the Chair, the Hearing Board shall include an equal number of voting graduate students and faculty. (See GSRR 5.1.2, and 5.1.5.)
- C. The Program will train hearing board members about these procedures and the applicable sections of the GSRR. (See GSRR 5.1.3.)

III. REFERRAL TO THE HEARING BOARD:

- A. After consulting with the instructor and appropriate unit administrator, graduate students who remain dissatisfied with their attempt to resolve an allegation of a violation of student academic rights or an allegation of academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards or falsifying admission and academic records) may request an academic grievance hearing. When appropriate, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, may waive jurisdiction and refer the request for an initial hearing to the College Hearing Board. (See GSRR 5.3.6.2.)
- B. At any time in the grievance process, either party may consult with the University Ombudsperson. (See GSRR 5.3.2.)
- C. In cases of ambiguous jurisdiction, the Dean of The Graduate School will select the appropriate Hearing Board for cases involving graduate students. (See GSRR 5.3.5.)
- D. Generally, the deadline for submitting the written request for a hearing is the middle of the next semester in which the student is enrolled (including Summer). In cases in which a student seeks to contest an allegation of academic misconduct and the student's dean has called for an academic disciplinary hearing, the student has **10** class days to request an academic grievance to contest the allegation. (See GSRR 5.3.6.1 and 5.5.2.2.)
- E. If either the student (the complainant) or the respondent (usually, the instructor or an

administrator) is absent from the university during that semester, or if other appropriate reasons emerge, the Hearing Board may grant an extension of this deadline. If the university no longer employs the respondent before the grievance hearing commences, the hearing may proceed. (See GSRR 5.4.9.)

- F. A written request for an academic grievance hearing must (1) specify the specific bases for the grievance, including the alleged violation(s), (2) identify the individual against whom the grievance is filed (the respondent) and (3) state the desired redress. Anonymous grievances will not be accepted. (See GSRR 5.1 and 5.3.6.)

IV. PRE-HEARING PROCEDURES

- A. After receiving a graduate student's written request for a hearing, the Chair of the Department will promptly refer the grievance to the Chair of the Hearing Board. (See GSRR 5.3.2, 5.4.3.)
- B. Within **5** class days, the Chair of the Hearing Board will:
 - 1. forward the request for a hearing to the respondent and ask for a written response;
 - 2. send the names of the Hearing Board members to both parties and, to avoid conflicts of interest between the two parties and the Hearing Board members, request written challenges, if any, within **3** class days of this notification. In addition to conflict of interest challenges, either party can challenge two hearing board members without cause (GSRR 5.1.7.c);
 - 3. rule promptly on any challenges, impanel a Hearing Board and send each party the names of the Hearing Board members. If the Chair of the Hearing Board is the subject of a challenge, the challenge shall be filed with the Dean of the College, or designee (See GSRR 5.1.7.). Decisions by the Hearing Board chair or the College Dean (or designee) on conflict of interest challenges are final;
 - 4. send the Hearing Board members a copy of the request for a hearing and the respondent's written response, and send all parties a copy of these procedures.

- C. Within **5** class days of being established, the Hearing Board shall review the request, and, after considering all requested and submitted information:
1. accept the request, in full or in part, and promptly schedule a hearing.
 2. reject the request and provide a written explanation to appropriate parties; e.g., lack of jurisdiction. (The student may appeal this decision.)
 3. the GSRR allows the hearing board to invite the two parties to meet with the Hearing Board in an informal session to try to resolve the matter. Such a meeting does not preclude a later hearing. However, by the time a grievance is requested all informal methods of conflict resolution should have been exhausted so this option is rarely used. (See GSRR 5.4.6.)
- D. If the Hearing Board calls for a hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall promptly negotiate a hearing date, schedule an additional meeting only for the Hearing Board should additional deliberations on the findings become necessary, and request a written response to the grievance from the respondent.
- E. At least **5** class days before the scheduled hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall notify the respondent and the complainant in writing of the (1) time, date, and place of the hearing; (2) the names of the parties to the grievance; (3) a copy of the hearing request and the respondent's reply; and (4) the names of the Hearing Board members after any challenges. (See GSRR 5.4.7.)
- F. At least **3** class days before the scheduled hearing, the parties must notify the Chair of the Hearing Board the names of their witnesses and advisor, if any, and request permission for the advisor to have voice at the hearing. The chair may grant or deny this request. The Chair will promptly forward the names given by the complainant to the respondent and visa versa. (See GSRR 5.4.7.1.)
- G. The Chair of the Hearing Board may accept written statements from either party's witnesses at least **3** class days before the hearing. (See GSRR 5.4.9.)
- H. In unusual circumstances and in lieu of a personal appearance, either party may request permission to submit a written statement to the Hearing Board or request permission to

participate in the hearing through an electronic communication channel. Written statements must be submitted to the Hearing Board at least **3** class days before the scheduled hearing. (See GSRR 5.4.9c.)

- I. Either party to the grievance hearing may request a postponement of the hearing. The Hearing Board may either grant or deny the request. (See GSRR 5.4.8.)
- J. At its discretion, the Hearing Board may set a reasonable time limit for each party to present its case, and the Chair of the Hearing Board must inform the parties of such a time limit in the written notification of the hearing.
- K. Hearings are closed unless the student requests an open hearing, which would be open to all members of the MSU community. The Hearing Board may close an open hearing to protect the confidentiality of information or to maintain order. (See GSRR 5.4.10.4.)
- L. Members of the Hearing Board are expected to respect the confidentiality of the hearing process. (See GSRR 5.4.10.4. and 5.4.11.)

V. HEARING PROCEDURES:

- A. The Hearing will proceed as follows:
 - 1. Introductory remarks by the Chair of the Hearing Board: The Chair of the Hearing Board introduces hearing panel members, the complainant, the respondent and advisors, if any. The Chair reviews the hearing procedures, including announced time restraints for presentations by each party and the witnesses, and informs the parties if their advisors may have a voice in the hearings and if the proceedings are being recorded. Witnesses shall be excluded from the proceedings except when testifying. The Chair also explains:
 - In academic grievance hearings in which a graduate student alleges a violation of academic rights, the student bears the burden of proof.
 - In hearings in which a graduate student seeks to contest allegations of academic misconduct, the instructor bears the burden of proof.

- All Hearing Board decisions must be reached by a majority of the Hearing Board, based on a "clear and convincing evidence." (See GSRR 8.1.18.)

(See GSRR 5.4.10.1 and 8.1.18.) For various other definitions, see GSRR Article 8.)

2. If the complainant fails to appear in person or via an electronic channel at a scheduled hearing, the Hearing Board may either postpone the hearing or dismiss the case for demonstrated cause. (See GSRR 5.4.9a.)
3. If the respondent fails to appear in person or via an electronic channel at a scheduled hearing, the Hearing Board may postpone the hearing or, only in unusual circumstances, hear the case in his or her absence. (See GSRR 5.4.9-b.)
4. If the respondent is absent from the University during the semester of the grievance hearing or no longer employed by the University before the grievance procedure concludes, the hearing process may still proceed. (See GSRR 5.3.6.1.)
5. To assure orderly questioning, the Chair of the Hearing Board will recognize individuals before they speak. All parties have a right to speak without interruption. Each party has a right to question the other party and to rebut any oral or written statements submitted to the Hearing Board. (See GSRR 5.4.10.2.)
6. Presentation by the Complainant: The Chair recognizes the complainant to present without interruption any statements relevant to the complainant's case, including the redress sought. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the complainant by the Hearing Board, the respondent and the respondent's advisor, if any.
7. Presentation by the Complainant's Witnesses: The Chair recognizes the complainant's witnesses, if any, to present, without interruption, any statement directly relevant to the complainant's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the witnesses by the Hearing Board, the respondent, and the respondent's advisor, if any.
8. Presentation by the Respondent: The Chair recognizes the respondent to present without interruption any statements relevant to the respondent's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the respondent by the Hearing Board, the

complainant, and the complainant's advisor, if any.

9. Presentation by the Respondent's Witnesses: The Chair recognizes the respondent's witnesses, if any, to present, without interruption, and statement directly relevant to the respondent's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the witnesses by the Hearing Board, the complainant, and the complainant's advisor, if any.
10. Rebuttal and Closing Statement by Complainant: The complainant refutes statements by the respondent, the respondent's witnesses and advisor, if any, and presents a final summary statement.
11. Rebuttal and Closing Statement by Respondent: The respondent refutes statements by the complainant, the complainant's witnesses and advisor, if any, and presents a final summary statement.
12. Final questions by the Hearing Board: The Hearing Board asks questions of any of the participants in the hearing.

VI. POST-HEARING PROCEDURES

A. Deliberation:

After all evidence has been presented, with full opportunity for explanations, questions and rebuttal, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall excuse all parties to the grievance and convene the Hearing Board to determine its findings in executive session. When possible, deliberations should take place directly following the hearing and/or at the previously scheduled follow-up meeting. (See Section IV.D above.)

B. Decision:

1. In grievance (non-disciplinary) hearings involving graduate students in which a majority of the Hearing Board finds, based on "clear and convincing evidence," that a violation of the student's academic rights has occurred and that redress is possible, it shall recommend an appropriate remedy to the Department Chair or

School Director. Upon receiving the Hearing Board's recommendation, the Department Chair or School Director shall implement an appropriate remedy, in consultation with the Hearing Board, within **3** class days. If the Hearing Board finds that no violation of academic rights has occurred, it shall so inform the Chair or Director. The Chair of the Hearing Board shall promptly forward copies of the final decision to parties and the University Ombudsperson. (See GSRR 5.4.11.)

2. In grievance (non-disciplinary) hearings involving graduate students in which the Hearing Board serves as the initial hearing body to adjudicate an allegation of academic dishonesty and, based on "clear and convincing evidence," the Hearing Board finds for the student, the Hearing Board shall recommend to the Department Chair or School Director that the penalty grade be removed, the Academic Dishonesty Report be removed from the student's records and a "good faith judgment" of the student's academic performance in the course take place. If the Hearing Board finds for the instructor, the penalty grade shall stand and the Academic Dishonesty Report regarding the allegation will remain on file, pending an appeal, if any to the College Hearing Board within **5** class days of the Hearing Board's decision. If an academic disciplinary hearing is pending, and the Hearing Board decides for the instructor, the graduate student's disciplinary hearing before either the College Hearing Board or the Dean of The Graduate School would promptly follow, pending an appeal, if any, within **5** class days. (See GSRR 5.5.2.2 and 5.4.12.3)

C. Written Report:

The Chair of the Hearing Board shall prepare a written report of the Hearing Board's findings, including recommended redress or sanctions for the complainant, if applicable, and forward a copy of the decision to the appropriate unit administrator within **3** class days of the hearing. The report shall indicate the rationale for the decision and the major elements of evidence, or lack thereof, that support the Hearing Board's decision. The administrator, in consultation with the Hearing Board, shall then implement an appropriate remedy. The report also should inform the parties of the right to appeal within **5** class days following notice of the decision, or **5** class days if an academic disciplinary hearing is pending. The Chair shall forward copies of the Hearing Board's report and the administrator's redress, if applicable, to the parties involved, the responsible administrators, the University Ombudsperson and the Dean of The Graduate School. All recipients must respect the confidentiality of the report and of the hearing board's deliberations resulting in a decision. (See GSRR 5.4.12 and 5.5.2.2)

VII. APPEAL OF THE HEARING BOARD DECISION:

- A. Either party may appeal a decision by the Hearing Board to the College Hearing Board for cases involving (1) academic grievances alleging violations of student rights and (2) alleged violations of regulations involving academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, professional standards or falsification of admission and academic records.) (See GSRR 5.4.12.)

- B. All appeals must be in writing, signed and submitted to the Chair of the College Hearing Board within **5** class days following notification of the Hearing Board's decision. While under appeal, the original decision of the Hearing Board will be held in abeyance. (See GSRR 5.4.12, 5.4.12.2 and 5.4.12.3.)

- C. A request for an appeal of a Hearing Board decision to the College Hearing Board must allege, in sufficient particularity to justify a hearing, that the initial Hearing Board failed to follow applicable procedures for adjudicating the hearing or that findings of the Hearing Board were not supported by "clear and convincing evidence." The request also must include the redress sought. Presentation of new evidence normally will be inappropriate. (See GSRR 5.4.12.1, 5.4.12.2 and 5.4.12.4.)

VIII. RECONSIDERATION:

If new evidence should arise, either party to a hearing may request the appropriate Hearing Board to reconsider the case within **30** days upon receipt of the hearing outcome. The written request for reconsideration is to be sent to the Chair of the Hearing Board, who shall promptly convene the Hearing Board to review the new material and render a decision on a new hearing. (See GSRR 5.4.13.)

IX. FILE COPY:

The Chair of the Department shall file a copy of these procedures with the Office of the Ombudsperson and with the Dean of The Graduate School. (See GSRR 5.4.1.)