

SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

**LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT
and
OPERATIONS AND SOURCING MANAGEMENT**

**DOCTORAL PROGRAMS DESCRIPTION AND
DOCTORAL STUDENT MANUAL**

Michigan State University
Revised: January 2018
SCM faculty approved: April 2018

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

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS	3
III. BASIC DEGREE REQUIREMENTS.....	5
A. Logistics Curriculum Requirements.....	6
B. Operations and Sourcing Management Curriculum Requirements.....	7
C. Additional Program Requirements.....	7
1. First Year Research Paper	8
2. Second Year Research Paper	8
IV. COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION	8
A. Purpose and Objectives of Comprehensive Exam	8
B. Structure of the Examination.....	9
C. Timing and Preparation for the Exam.....	9
D. Grading	10
V. DISSERTATION REQUIREMENTS.....	10
A. The Dissertation Committee.....	11
B. Dissertation Proposal Defense.....	11
C. Human Research Protection Program.....	12
D. Final Dissertation Presentation.....	12
E. Dissertation Project: A Word of Caution.....	12
F. Example Timetable for Program Completion.....	13
G. Checklist and Deadlines	14
VI. GUIDELINES FOR INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP	14
A. Student Feedback and Criteria for Dismissal.....	14
B. Faculty Expectations for Doctoral Students.....	15
C. Faculty Responsibilities in Mentoring and Guidance.....	16
D. Teaching Eligibility and Requirements.....	16
VII. LIST OF APPENDICES	0
Appendix A: Comprehensive Examination Grading Criteria	0
Appendix B: Student Progress Evaluation Form.....	0
Appendix C: Graduate Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures for the Supply Chain Management Program	2

I. INTRODUCTION

The Supply Chain Management Department offers students the opportunity to study the complete breadth and depth of logistics, operations and sourcing within the context of overall supply chain management with two distinct doctoral programs. 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. Overall, students should be capable of generating, applying and disseminating knowledge in their specific functional areas and the broad area of supply chain management.

Students in the LDP and OSMDP are encouraged to design their course of study within the larger context of supply chain management. Within the programs, students are expected to focus their efforts on empirical and/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.

II. ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

Students complete an 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 <https://grad.msu.edu/apply/online.aspx>. Application to the program also requires the following materials:

1. College transcripts showing grades received while pursuing all prior undergraduate and graduate degrees if any.
2. 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.
3. 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 (<https://grad.msu.edu/english-language-competency>). The program does not allow provisional admission; applicants must demonstrate proficiency prior to admission.
4. 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).

5. A pre-admission interview is required. 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, online video interviews may be conducted.

The Supply Chain Management Doctoral Program Committee (SCMDPC) is comprised of up to six tenure-track faculty appointed by the Department Chairperson for two-year, renewable terms. Three members are Logistics (LOG) faculty and three members are Operations and Sourcing (OSM) faculty. The LOG (OSM) members of the SCMDPC screen applications to determine the fit with current LOG (OSM) faculty. The decision regarding admission is based on the applicant's GMAT score, grade point average, interview, goal statement, letters of recommendation, and previous work and/or academic experience. LOG (OSM) applicants are then considered for admission by the LOG (OSM) members of the SCMDPC with input from other department faculty. 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 or GRE Cumulative score is lower than the 75th percentile. Students begin the program in the Fall semester. 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 graduate assistantship that is available for up to four years. For the nine-month academic year, these assistantships include a monthly stipend and a tuition allowance. Students may also be offered the opportunity to teach or conduct research during the summer for additional support. 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).

During their first year, students will be assigned as Teaching Assistants (TA) and/or Research Assistants (RA) to department faculty as determined by the Department Chairperson. During subsequent years, students will independently teach one undergraduate SCM course each year as scheduled by the Department Chairperson in addition to their Assistantship assignments.

The three LOG (OSM) members of the SCMDPC and an additional LOG (OSM) faculty member serve as the four-member Program Guidance Committee (PGC) for the LOG (OSM) doctoral students. The role of the PGC is to provide mentoring and guidance to students during the doctoral program. Further, the PGC will work with each student during the first year of the program to develop a curriculum plan using the "GradPlan" (<https://grad.msu.edu/gradplan>).

Students must also complete various orientation and training programs, such as training on Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct, Research Integrity (possibly including but not limited to CITI courses in support of Responsible Conduct of Research [RCR]), Human Research Protection and any other workshop series organized by the Graduate School that may be necessary based upon the project on which the student is working. Students will receive

emails from the university and college regarding these training requirements. Students who fail to complete required training will be considered ineligible for TA, RA, or fellowship funding until training is completed. Students are responsible for providing documentation of all completed training to the SCM department Doctoral Program Committee (DDPC).

III. BASIC DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

The LDP and OSMDP concentrate on developing a student's knowledge in the specific fields of logistics and operations and sourcing management, and in the general field of supply chain management. This requires competencies be developed in each of the following areas:

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. Both LOG and OSM students will complete one common course on theories used in SCM research. The *LOG* courses focus on reviewing logistics research and logistics research methods. The *OSM* courses include research topics covered in operations and sourcing literature.

Concentration Areas

Each student selects an area of concentration (e.g., econometrics, information technology, LOG, marketing, OSM) outside of the major. Ideally, the concentration area complements the major in support of the dissertation research as well as future teaching and research interests. Typically, concentration fields require the completion of three doctoral courses (9 credit hours), although credit hours vary by concentration area. Additionally, the department granting the concentration may require a student to pass competency requirements. Students must gain approval of the concentration granting department, when required, and the student's PGC prior to beginning concentration coursework.

Research Methods

Students must develop and demonstrate competence in research methods and the ability to complete independent research. As such, students take at least four courses (12 credit hours) focused on developing research competency.

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.

Note: 24 SCM 999 credits are required for graduation; students can enroll for a maximum of 36 SCM 999 credits. Requests for overrides to exceed the maximum of 36 credits of 999 must be directed to the Office of the Registrar.

Economics and/or Behavioral Analysis

Students must develop and demonstrate competence in economic and/or behavioral analysis by completing graduate level course work in one or both of these areas. This requirement can be

satisfied by taking 800 or 900 level courses in Economics, Sociology, Psychology, or another core discipline as approved by the PGC.

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 student's PGC 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 is likely to include statistics, economics, and business concepts. Additional course work might delay the typical timeline for doctoral program completion.

A. Logistics Curriculum Requirements

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

- SCM 910 – SCM Theory
- SCM 932 – Current Logistics Topics
- SCM 930 – Evolution of Logistics Thought and Research
- Either SCM 941, SCM 942, or SCM 918 (described below, pick one), or SCM 990 – Independent Study or other course approved by the student's PGC.

Nine (9) Credits for an area of concentration in consultation with the student's PGC

Fifteen (15) Credits of Methods Courses as follows:

- MGT 906 – Organizational Research Methods or CEP 921 – Psychometric Theory I
- MGT 914 – Advanced Organizational Research Methods
- MKT 907 – Statistical Models in Marketing or equivalent Structural Equations Modeling course
- Two additional courses as approved by the students PGC.

Three (3) Credits of economics, behavioral, strategy, or other areas.

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

Total of 39 credit hours required for seminars/courses

Total of 24 research (SCM 999) credit hours required (No more than 36 credits without Registrar's Office approval)

Note: Per college requirements, to be in good academic 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.

B. Operations and Sourcing Management Curriculum Requirements

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

- SCM 910 – SCM Theory
- SCM 941 – Empirical Research in OSM
- SCM 942 – Analytic Research in OSM
- SCM 918 – Procurement and Sourcing Theory

Nine (9) Credits for an area of concentration in consultation with the student's PGC. Typical areas of concentration include Econometrics or Analytics.

Twelve (12) Credits of Methods Courses as follows:

- EC820A – Econometrics 1A
- EC820B – Econometrics 1B
- MGT 906 – Organizational Research Methods
- MGT 914 – Advanced Organizational Research Methods

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

- Two courses selected in consultation with the OSM PGC is required.

Total of 39 credit hours required for seminars/courses

Total of 24 research (SCM 999) credit hours required (No more than 36 credits without Registrar's Office approval)

Note: Per college requirements, to be in good academic 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.

C. Additional Program Requirements

Given that both the LDP and OSMDP are research-oriented programs, publications are highly desirable for all doctoral students. Publications enhance the visibility of MSU and the SCM department, and help ensure that students will be placed in first-rate academic positions. Publications also help the students understand the research process and tasks necessary to take a research paper from concept to publication.

1. First Year Research Paper

Students are required to complete a first-year paper. The focus of the paper is a literature review and gap analysis on an SCM-related topic. The paper should be written under the supervision of a regular (tenure-track) faculty member, and completion is approved by the student's PGC. The paper is due before the start of the student's second fall semester, and must be presented orally to department faculty and doctoral students in that fall semester. Failure to meet this requirement will result in an unsatisfactory evaluation.

2. Second Year Research Paper

Students must complete the second-year research project before they sit for their comprehensive examination. The paper should be written under the supervision of a regular (tenure-track) faculty member, and completion is approved by the student's PGC when the paper is deemed ready for submission to an academic publication or conference. After approval by the PGC, the student must also present the paper orally to department faculty and doctoral students. This paper is normally completed before the end of the second summer in the program. To stay on target for degree completion, the second-year paper should be completed no later than the student's third fall semester.

If the project involves collecting data from human research subjects, students are responsible for obtaining prior approval through the MSU Human Research Protection Program.

IV. COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION

A. Purpose and Objectives of Comprehensive Exam

The purpose of the examination is to ensure that students advancing to PhD-candidate status have sufficient mastery of the body of knowledge and scholarly methods to enable them to pursue high quality, independent dissertation research. As such, the comprehensive 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, 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 comprehensive examination is taken by each student upon completion of the major courses and the methods courses. Generally, students will take the exam in the summer of their 2nd year

or early in their 3rd 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.

Students schedule the exam in consultation with their PGC and the Department Chairperson based on the status of the students needing to sit for the exam. The exam 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.

B. 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 theory, research, and 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. Students may be given options to choose among alternative questions.
3. An 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 before the exam grading is finalized.

C. Timing and Preparation for the Exam

Students are required to submit a written request to their PGC to sit for the exam at least three months in advance of the desired examination date. The student's PGC and the Department Chairperson will verify student eligibility for the exam. The PGC will coordinate the content and scheduling of the exam for all eligible students, and select faculty to contribute exam questions as well as grade exams.

Students are encouraged to review previous exam questions prior to taking the exam. Students should also consult with faculty members; especially those who have taught the major 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.

The comprehensive exam is not a "big final" that covers only material encountered in core classes. Students studying for comprehensive exams 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 respective examination fields.

D. Grading

Two faculty, selected by the student's PGC, will grade each question.

There are three sections to the exam: (1) Theory; (2) Strategy and Application; and (3) Research Methodology and Design. Each section requires at least one question be answered from a set of questions.

1. To pass a section of the exam, a student must have an overall average score of 85 percent across the questions in that section. Each question is weighted the same in computing the section average.
2. Any failed sections must be retaken. Only one retake is allowed and it must occur within 12 months of the date that the first exam was taken.
3. If a student does not pass the exam on the second attempt or does not or cannot take the exam again, he or she will be terminated from the program at the end of the semester in which the exam was last taken.
4. Faculty grade the examination items, individually, without student names attached to them using the scale shown in Appendix A. 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 results of each faculty grade are given to the Chair of the SCMDPC who summarizes the results and provides them for review for the remaining committee members. If the grade differential between two grades for a question are 10 points or greater, a third faculty will be asked to grade the question and that grade will be included in the grade average.
5. When individual grading is complete, the LDPC and OSMDPC will meet to discuss the exam grades and will determine pass/fail status and next steps, if applicable.

V. DISSERTATION REQUIREMENTS

The Ph.D. dissertation is the capstone of the doctoral education program. When completed, it signifies individual competence as a researcher, and serves as a public document. 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 research that makes a significant contribution to theory. The goal is to generate publishable results to launch the student on a successful academic career.

A. The Dissertation Committee

A dissertation committee, composed of at least **four** regular faculty members from MSU, one of whom is designated chairperson, supervises the dissertation process. 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.

B. 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. 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. 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 Senior Associate Dean.

In a closed session following the proposal 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.

C. Human Research Protection Program

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 Human Research Protection Program. 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.

D. 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. All course work (except for dissertation research credits) must be completed with grades reported before the student is permitted to defend the dissertation.

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

In a closed session following the presentation, the committee formally votes to determine whether or not the student has completed the dissertation research. A successful defense of the dissertation 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.

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 review the Graduate School's requirements 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.

E. 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. Dissertation research and writing usually takes about a

year, although additional time is sometimes needed. 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.

F. 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 PROGRAM SCHEDULE BY YEAR AND SEMESTER**

	Fall	Spring	Summer
Year 1	Major/concentration/ research courses	Major/concentration/ research courses	Complete 1st year research paper (SCM 999)
Year 2	Major/concentration/ research courses	Major/concentration/ research courses	Finish 2 nd year research paper (SCM 999)
Year 3	Comp Exam Concentration courses	Research (SCM 999)	Proposal defense
Year 4	Research (SCM 999)	Research (SCM 999)	Dissertation defense

G. 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
Grad Plan approval		Within 1 semester of PGC formation
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

VI. 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 documented University's Research Integrity Guidelines.

An additional and important source of information is the documented Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities and the documented Code of Teaching Responsibility.

A. Student Feedback and 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 annually to identify potential problems and help students stay on track. The annual evaluation process includes the following: (1) the student completes the online Annual Progress Report (APR) upon notification by the college; (2) the LDPC or OSMDPC, respectively, completes the Broad College of Business Ph.D. Student Progress Evaluation Form; and (3) the LDPC or OSMDPC,

respectively, meets with each student individually to discuss the completed SAR and evaluation form as well as the student overall progress.

Any action for dismissal requires unanimous 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.**
- 2. Failure to meet expectations as documented in annual evaluation.**
- 3. Failure to pass comprehensive exams as previously discussed.**
- 4. Failure to meet university requirements for satisfactory completion of the dissertation.**
- 5. Violations of academic integrity or other university policies.** Throughout all stages of their career at MSU, the highest level of academic integrity in scholarship and research is expected.

B. 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 expected 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.

When a student is holding an assistantship, it 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, 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.

C. 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 documented Guidelines for Graduate Student Advising and Mentoring Relationships.

D. 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.

Before students can serve in any teaching capacity, they must complete MSU's TA Orientation program. Students whose first language is not English must also pass the SPEAK test and attend MSU's International Teaching Assistant program.

VII. LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Comprehensive Examination Grading Criteria

Criteria	Below 75	75-79	80-84	85-89*	90-94*	95-100*
Organization and Flow	No structure applied; essay difficult to follow	Limited structure applied, but poorly designed to guide reader	Shows tendency to stray from the point	Coherent structure, appropriate to the topic	Above average structure, generally sticks to point	Excellent structure
Writing	Poor writing style	Writing style difficult to follow	Writing style needs improvement	Acceptable writing style	Above average writing style, easy to read	Superior writing style, journal submission quality
Literature Support	Little to no literature support	Unfamiliar with relevant literature or lacking sufficient support for ideas	Some coverage of most relevant pieces of literature, mostly applied appropriately	Adequate coverage of most relevant pieces of literature, generally applied appropriately	Missing a limited few relevant references, most applications appropriate	All relevant literature cited, and appropriately applied
Theory (where applicable)	Theory absent	Theory present, but poorly selected or poorly applied	Appropriate theory(s) applied, shortfalls in description or explanation	Appropriate theory(s) applied with adequate explanation to question	Excellent application of a well explained and appropriate theory	Exact right theory, explained perfectly
Method (where applicable)	No method applied or described	Inappropriate method applied.	Appropriate method proposed, but poorly supported or describe how it will be performed	Correct method applied with adequate description or proposed application	Correct method applied in a well explained manner	Exact right method explained perfectly
Integration of	Ideas disjointed, connections that	Limited integration of ideas, but key	Attempts made to integrate ideas, but	Acceptable connection of	Good connection of ideas, minor	All ideas well integrated, no

Thought	should be made are missed	relationships not discussed/present	incomplete	ideas. Some relationships missed	relationships missed	connections missed
Creativity	Misguided thinking	Missed the question, or poorly conceived ideas.	Addresses question, but answers with most basic level of understanding	Addresses question with expected answer	Applied creative ideas/solution to question posed	Develops innovative way of fully addressing question

* Shaded area indicates a passing score.

Appendix B: Student Progress Evaluation Form

Student Name: _____ Time period of evaluation: _____

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	N/A	Unacceptable	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
COURSEWORK					
Performance in major courses					
Performance in other courses					
Comprehensive exam ¹					
Comments/Notes:					
TEACHING					
Teaching/TA performance					
Ability to teach independently					
Progress towards teaching excellence*					
Comments/Notes:					
RESEARCH					
Level of participation in research led by others					
Ability to perform independent research					
Progress towards proposal/dissertation					
Ability to publish research					
Progress towards first tier publication*					
Comments/Notes:					

CAREER SOCIALIZATION					
Responsible conduct of research training					
Participation in departmental & college activities					
Participation in conferences					
Progress towards national visibility*					
Comments/Notes:					
PROGRAM SPECIFIC MILESTONES					
Completion of Summer Research Paper #1					
Completion of Summer Research Paper #2					
Other:					
OVERALL					
Timely progress towards degree completion*					

Student's Signature and Date of Receipt: _____

(copy to student, copy to Dean's office, signed original to file)

Other comments/notes (performance trend w.r.t. previous evaluations, professional presentations, preparation for job market; is performance so poor as to incur review of assistantship status or refusal of 5th year funding?, etc.)

Appendix C: Graduate Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures for the Supply Chain 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 **Supply Chain 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 SUPPLY CHAIN 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.)

Approved by Faculty (insert date)