

MANAGEMENT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND DOCTORAL STUDENT MANUAL

Michigan State University
Department of Management
Revised September 2021

Note: Program applicants desiring further information should contact:
Management Doctoral Program Coordinator
Michigan State University
Department of Management
East Lansing, MI 48824-1122
mgt@bus.msu.edu

CONTENTS

Topic	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS	4
III. BASIC COURSE REQUIREMENTS	6
A. Overview of Course Requirements	6
B. Development of Competence in the Major Area.....	6
1. The core courses	6
2. The minor.....	7
3. Independent Study (MGT 890)	7
C. Development of Research Competence	8
1. Coursework.....	8
2. Management 890 (Independent Study)	8
3. Independent Empirical Research Proposal.....	9
D. Competence in Economics and/ Behavioral Analysis	9
E. Course Requirement Summary.....	9
F. Responsible Conduct of Research.....	10
IV. EXPECTATIONS, ADVICE, AND FEEDBACK	11
A. Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	12
B. Faculty Expectations for Doctoral Students.....	12
C. Faculty Advisor for New Graduate Students	14
D. Feedback to Graduate Students	15
E. Academic Integrity.....	16
F. Conflict Resolution	17
G. International Travel	17
G. Grief Absence Policy.....	17
G. Work Related Policies	18
V. THE MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION	19
A. Structure of the Examination	20
B. Procedures Regarding the Examination.....	20
VI. THE DISSERTATION	22
A. The Dissertation Committee.....	22
B. Dissertation Proposal Defense.....	23
C. Final Dissertation Presentation	24
D. Dissertation Project: A Word of Caution.....	24
E. Electronic Submissions of Theses and Dissertations	24
VII. EXAMPLE CURRICULUM TIMETABLE	25
VIII. CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION TO CONSORTIA.....	26

A.	Performance as a Student.....	26
B.	Career Stage and Interest.....	26
IX.	EXIT SURVEYS.....	27
X.	THE FACULTY	27
XI.	UNIVERSITY RESOURCES.....	35
A.	Equal Opportunity, Non-Discrimination & Affirmative Action	35
B.	Student Rights and Responsibilities.....	35
C.	Library Resources	35
D.	Useful Contacts.....	35
XII.	LIST OF APPENDICES	36
A.	Report of the Guidance Committee -- Doctoral Program	37
B.	Management Student Progress Evaluation Form.....	39
C.	Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria	41
D.	Code of Teaching Responsibility.....	43
E.	Academic Hearing Procedure	46
F.	Grievance Procedure	54

I. INTRODUCTION

The Management Department at Michigan State University provides its members the opportunity to explore the complete breadth and depth of the general field of management. We are composed of faculty members and students who do research on Human Resource Management, Organizational Behavior, Organization Theory, and Strategic Management. Our doctoral program places primary emphasis on the development of scholars with competence in the general field of management as well as in a chosen field of concentrated specialization. Such scholars should be capable of generating, communicating to others, and applying knowledge in their disciplines.

Doctoral students in our program are encouraged to design individually meaningful curricula within the larger context of our field. Along with our dedication to organizational research, the variety of doctoral courses available in our program offer opportunities to our students that are not available elsewhere. Our strong working relationships with other university programs (such as Organizational Psychology, Sociology and Economics) broaden the variety of courses of study our doctoral students can pursue.

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

II. ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

General: 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). *International applicants also must possess strong scores on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)*. 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.

Specifically:

Application to our program is based on the following materials:

1. A completed on-line application for admission to graduate studies at MSU with fees paid. The application form can be obtained on-line from <http://grad.msu.edu/apply/> After the application is submitted and fee paid, you

will receive an email to set up an account in the Student Portal.

2. College transcripts showing grades received while pursuing all prior undergraduate degrees as well as graduate degrees, if any. Official copies must be sent directly to the Department of Management.
3. Three letters of reference from individuals who are able to appraise your personal interests, abilities, and the likelihood that you will successfully complete our Ph.D. program. Applicants can invite their recommenders to upload their letter of reference via the student portal or it can be mailed directly to the Management Department. There is no specific form for letters of reference.
4. Standardized Test Scores: The Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) is preferred, but Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores will also be considered. *International applicants only: the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL).*
5. A written statement of personal goals. This statement should address (a) the area(s) of management in which you are interested, (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).

A committee of 4-5 faculty members forms the admissions committee that screens applications. Applicants passing this initial screening are then considered for acceptance by the complete Management faculty.

We also examine the fit between our program and the applicant's interests based on the applicant's goal statement, letters of recommendation, and previous work and/or academic experience.

We review applications in the Spring semester for admission to the program in the Fall. We normally admit about one to four students per year in order to preserve an appropriately low faculty-student ratio. Admissions standards and procedures conform to the equal opportunity and affirmative action policies of MSU.

III. COURSE AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

A. Overview of Course Requirements.

The Ph.D. curriculum prepares competent research professionals through concentration on the following related areas of study (which will be more fully described later):

1. The Management major, minor, and independent study

2. Research methods
3. Economics and/or behavioral analysis
4. Other business fields
5. Responsible conduct of research

Thus, students must complete the following course requirements:

1. The major (MGT 907, 908, 909, 910)
2. The minor (course requirements will vary)
3. Independent study-6 credits (MGT 890)
4. The research component (including MGT 906 & 914, required)
5. Competency in economics and/or behavioral analysis
6. Business concepts coursework

B. Development of Competence in the Major Area.

Several elements of the Management program are directed toward developing knowledge in the general field of organizational behavior. First, all students take a series of four core seminars that cover Human Resource Management, Organizational Behavior, Strategy Process, and Strategic Management. Second, each student completes a minor in a field related to the major, e.g., Organizational Psychology, Social Psychology, Finance, Political Science, Industrial Sociology, International Business, Economics, etc. Third, each student completes a program of independent study in an area of personal interest. This can be completed by taking three related courses, by doing a research project, or by pursuing a related combination of courses and research projects. Fourth, the student completes a research component that includes the Management program's seminars on organizational research methods. There is no set sequence to taking any of these courses, but students are encouraged to take the core courses as soon as possible. The culmination of this preparation is the written comprehensive examination in Management.

1. The core courses:

Management 907: Seminar in Organizational Behavior (OB). This course examines theory and research on individual and group behavior in organizations. Topics addressed may include attitudes, motivation, conflict, relationships, groups, leadership, and international dimensions of organizational behavior.

Management 908: Seminar in Strategy Process. This course examines strategy development as a process that drives the parallel issues of formulation and implementation. It provides a survey of theory and research in this area.

Management 909: Seminar in Human Resource Management (HRM). This course focuses on research theories, methods, and issues in Human Resource (HR) management. Topics such as strategic human resource management, job analysis, work design, recruitment, selection, socialization, training, performance appraisal, career development, and compensation may form the content of this class. The primary focus is on recent empirical or theoretical research published in peer-reviewed academic journals.

Management 910: Seminar in Strategic Management (SM). Conceptual and empirical research on strategic management is surveyed and critiqued. Topics discussed may include types and conceptual dimensions of corporate and business strategies, market and industry dynamics, strategic decision-making, and corporate governance.

2. The minor:

Each student and the Management guidance committee (see Section IV C) select one relevant field of study outside of Management as a minor. Prior students have chosen topics such as Organizational Psychology, Sociology, Philosophy, Research Methods, Economics, and other functional areas in business (e.g., Marketing, Accounting, Finance, and International Business).

Depending upon each student's background and previous course work, he or she can request that some or all course work in the minor be waived. Typically, students complete four courses (12 credit hours) to satisfy the minor requirement. The decision on what is most appropriate for each student will be made in consultation with his or her guidance committee and the approval of the Department Chair.

3. Independent study:

Independent study is required to develop additional competence in an area that reflects students' specific interest area in the general field of management. Completing at least six credits of MGT 890, not to exceed 9 credit hours total per college requirements, fulfills the independent study requirement. The purpose of MGT 890 is to give each student experience in conducting research.

C. Development of Research Competence.

Pursuant to the Management Department's dedication to research, students must develop and display competence in research methods and the ability to pursue independent research. At least three interrelated activities contribute to the development of research competence.

1. **Coursework** – Students are required to complete the following two research methods courses:

Management 906: Seminar in Organizational Research Methods. In this course, social and behavioral research methods are presented at a level appropriate for doctoral students. The roles of theory and data as the building blocks of competence in Management are emphasized.

Management 914: Advanced Organizational Research Methods. In this course, students will learn some of the most widely-used methods to analyze data. Topics covered include multiple regression, mediation and moderation, factor analysis, structural equation modeling, multilevel modeling, social network analysis, and meta-analysis.

In addition to completing MGT 906 and MGT 914, students must complete two more courses in research-related areas. To fulfill this requirement, students normally take a sequence of core statistics courses. Courses that fulfill this requirement are often taken from (but are not limited to) the departments of Agricultural Economics, Communications, Economics, Educational Psychology, Political Science, Psychology, or Sociology. Verification should be obtained from the Management guidance committee (see Section IV C) as soon as possible regarding the acceptability of the student's choice of sequences.

2. **Management 890 (Independent Study)** - Besides meeting coursework requirements, the faculty also expect that students will develop research competence through hands-on research experience, by registering for MGT 890 credits and becoming part of ongoing research projects with current faculty (see independent study, above). This collaboration is typically seen as a partnership, but there are certain requirements students must meet. Although not all collaborations will include aspects of research, these credits are designed to assist the students in learning the research process from design and data collection through data analysis, manuscript preparation, and submission to a journal for review. MGT 890 is also an opportunity for faculty to provide students with feedback and instruction. Students are responsible for seeking out faculty members with whom they would be interested in working. It is strongly encouraged that students seek out multiple faculty members in the process of fulfilling MGT 890 requirements. Working with more than one professor helps to ensure broader knowledge of research processes and helps students to understand the interpersonal processes that occur when working with others. In addition, students are encouraged to engage in their own independent research once they have acquired the necessary research skills and received faculty approval.
3. **Independent Empirical Research Proposal** – MGT 890's should be used to create a research proposal. Under the direction of one faculty member,

each student should design an empirical research study and describe this study in a research proposal. The proposal may include material contained in papers used to fulfill previous course requirements, but it must be original. The faculty member must be satisfied that the proposal indicates that the student is prepared to engage in original and scientifically rigorous research.

D. Competence 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. The department PhD Coordinator establishes specific requirements. In general, students focusing on strategic management will fulfill this requirement with coursework in Economics. Students focusing on organizational behavior or human resource management will fulfill this requirement with six graduate level credits from the departments of: Economics, Sociology, Psychology, or other core discipline.

E. Course Requirement Summary.

Major: MGT 907, 908, 909, 910 (12 credit hours).

Minor: 3-4 courses (12 credit hours) in a field related to Management.

Independent Study: At least 6 semester hours of MGT 890, cannot take more than 6 in MGT.

Research: MGT 906 and MGT 914 plus two additional courses (12 hours total) including an approved statistics sequence.

Economics and/or Behavioral Analysis: 2 courses (6 credit hours) in economics and/or behavioral analysis (i.e., in core disciplines such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc.). For strategic management majors, two courses in Economics are required (examples: EC 421, EC 823, EC 860, EC 861).

Dissertation: Must complete a minimum of 24 MGT 999 credits for graduation; students can enroll for a maximum of 36 credits.

Note: No one course may be used to satisfy any two of the above requirements, with one exception: courses taken toward the minor may also be used to satisfy the economics and/or behavioral analysis requirement if those courses are in appropriate content areas (consult with PhD Coordinator regarding such courses). Per college and university 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.

F. Responsible Conduct of Research.

Training in the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) is essential for the preparation of future scholars and professionals. A plan for providing a foundation of responsible research conduct has been developed specifically for Broad College doctoral students and incorporates the requirements of the broader university. All Broad College doctoral students will complete the following training:

1) Year 1

All new doctoral students will complete 4 CITI online modules within the first year of enrollment in their program: *Completion of this requirement will be tracked by the University and College.*

- Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research
- Authorship
- Plagiarism
- Research Misconduct

In addition, all doctoral students will complete human subjects training in their first year. (Human Research Protection/ IRB Certification, in <http://Train.ORA.msu.edu>).

2) Discussion-Based Training

All doctoral students must complete a minimum of 6 hours of discussion-based training prior to receiving their degrees. Discussion-based training is provided by the Broad College and facilitated by its faculty. These hours will be completed as part of the ongoing training requirement as follows: 2 hours during the initial training session in the first year, and 1 ½ hours during each annual refresher until completion of the program.

3) Year 2

In year 2 of the doctoral program, Broad College students will complete 3 additional MSU online training modules, to be selected from the following list. *Completion of this requirement will be tracked by the University and College.*

- CITI Collaborative Research
- CITI Conflicts of Interest
- CITI Data Management
- CITI Peer Review

4) Annual Refresher Training in years 3 and beyond

Starting in year 3, all doctoral students must complete 3 hours of annual refresher training; this consists of a combination of readings or online courses beyond the 7 required in basic training, and 1 ½ hours of discussion-based training each year. *Completion of this requirement will be recorded by the department in GradInfo as “Annual” training.* Students will also need to renew their certification in human subjects training as required.

5) Although the Broad College strongly encourages its doctoral students to attend RCR training sessions offered within the college (i.e., discussion-based training during the initial, 2-hour session and during subsequent 1 ½ hour annual refresher sessions), the Graduate School also offers RCR training workshops at various times throughout the academic year (see <https://grad.msu.edu/rcr>). In any given year, doctoral students who do not attend the applicable discussion-based training session (i.e., initial RCR training or annual refresher) offered by the Broad College must attend commensurate workshops offered by the Graduate School in order to fulfill the RCR training requirement. Failure to fulfill the RCR training requirements outlined above may result in the withholding of a student’s assistantship and/or degree.

IV. EXPECTATIONS, ADVICE, AND FEEDBACK

General: A record of performance and action consistent with high professional standards is required of every degree candidate. 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. If this is not accomplished, 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. Students submit standardized annual review forms and Vitae, and these serve as the primary input to faculty discussions.

The formal review includes the following areas: performance in course work and on comprehensive examinations, performance in teaching and/or other duties that might be required of a graduate assistant, participation in department colloquia, responsible conduct of research training, 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 will be provided to the student, the student’s Doctoral Program Director, the Departmental Chairperson, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Students can access their academic records by making a request from the Program Director. If there is an error, the program director will assist 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, and so on. The program director will work with the student to ensure the speedy resolution of such problems.

Coursework is only part of the process of completing Ph.D. requirements in the Management program. This section contains information about additional aspects of our program.

A. Commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

MSU is committed to cultivating a safe and inclusive campus community characterized by caring and respect for others. We strive to foster a community that respects and values a broad range of backgrounds, viewpoints, and experiences and encourages and creates opportunities so all individuals can reach their full potential educationally and professionally. Accordingly, we expect faculty and students in the Management Department to uphold the highest standards of practice in diversity, equity, and inclusion.

B. Faculty Expectations for Doctoral Students.

1. The Management group invites speakers to MSU for faculty/student colloquia or job interviews. We expect that students will attend these guest presentations and related events. Our expectation concerning student attendance is based on our belief that organizational scientists should take advantage of every opportunity to learn about organizational behavior, human resources, strategy and what other researchers are currently doing in the field.
2. Students are expected to attend other informal (i.e. brownbag) meetings for Management faculty and students. These meetings serve as the organizational backbone of our group. They also provide students the opportunity to sharpen presentation skills and practice critical inquiry in a supportive atmosphere.
3. Students are strongly encouraged to attend 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.
4. Publications are highly desirable for all of our students. They enhance the visibility of our group, help to insure that students will be placed in first-rate academic jobs, and involve all of our members in the same central research process. Therefore, we encourage them vigorously.

5. Students are encouraged to obtain funds intended specifically for graduate students (e.g., dissertation completion fellowships offered by the College, publishers' awards; NSF grants; Department of Labor funds) for their dissertation research. Learning how to identify sources of support and write proposals is encouraged.
6. Students doing field research are expected to coordinate and/or collaborate with faculty members. Typically, faculty members provide contacts that students pursue. Sometimes, however, students make initial contacts and visit organizations alone or together with a faculty member.
7. Students with assistantships (either teaching or research) must be registered for a minimum of nine credit hours per semester during the regular academic year (minimum of three credits during summer semester). These credits must be consistent with making progress toward the attainment of the degree, and approval to take these courses must be attained from the student's advisor.
8. We expect our students to devote primary attention to doctoral pursuits, allowing them to finish their degrees in 4-5 years. As noted in a previous section, outside work for pay is considered an impediment to academic progress and must be approved by the Doctoral Program Director. Employment elsewhere prior to defense of the dissertation proposal is strongly discouraged and might jeopardize faculty support of student's continuation in program. Students not making satisfactory progress toward their degree after five years may be asked to leave the program.
9. Students are encouraged to attend national and professional conventions. National meetings of professional organizations (e.g., Academy of Management, Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Strategic Management Society) 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.
10. We expect our students to engage in the processes of dissertation proposal and defense in a timely manner. Faculty will not provide letters of recommendation to potential employers until the PhD student has successfully defended his or her dissertation proposal.

C. Faculty Advisor for New Graduate Students.

The faculty is responsible for providing guidance and mentoring to graduate students. 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>

The student's guidance committee shall be formed no later than the third semester of doctoral study, or within two semesters beyond the master's degree or its equivalent. Within one semester after the committee has met, the chairperson of the guidance committee shall file a guidance committee report with the dean of the college, listing all degree requirements.

GRADPLAN: All Ph.D. students will be required to use GRADPLAN.

During the first year, all new doctoral students will work with the doctoral program coordinator to develop a curriculum plan using the faculty advisor report form (Appendix A). Students will be encouraged during their first year to identify a potential faculty advisor who will advise and approve program design changes throughout their program. This advisor may remain so for the duration of a student's graduate career, or may be changed at the student's request as research interests and working relationships with other faculty evolve. However, at any given time, each graduate student will have a faculty advisor. With regard to general University Guidelines, the faculty advisor serves as the student's *Guidance Committee* chair.

The role of the faculty advisor is to work with the student to formulate a plan of study that meets the student's unique interests within the constraints imposed by department, college, and university requirements. This advisor may be distinct from any particular member of the student's dissertation committee, which is formed during the latter part of the student's graduate program.

By the end of the first year the report of the guidance committee must be completed and signed by the student, the guidance committee members, the Department Chairperson and the College Dean. Copies of this report are distributed to the student, the faculty advisor, the Department Chairperson, the College Dean, and MSU's Graduate College.

CHANGE OF ADVISOR/MAJOR PROFESSOR:

As per the Graduate handbook, students may ask to change advisors. This is often the result of a change in the student's research interests, but may be due to a variety reasons. To request a different advisor, the student should make the request directly to the department chair. The student, in consultation with the Department chair will identify possible replacement advisors. However, the potential replacement faculty advisors are under no obligation to accept the student as an advisee. In such cases it is the responsibility of the Chair to provide a faculty advisor.

D. Feedback to Graduate Students.

We strongly believe that it is important for graduate students to receive periodic

feedback about their progress in our program. The purpose of this feedback, generated from evaluation sessions attended by all Management faculty members, is to help each student develop to his or her greatest potential.

1. 1. For first year students, there will be a scheduled informal session held at the beginning of the Spring semester with the Management Doctoral Program Director, and a second, formal evaluation and feedback session held near the end of the Spring semester. Thereafter, there will be one formal session near the end of the Spring semester with the understanding that there will be unscheduled informal contact throughout the year.
2. For formal evaluation and feedback sessions, each student will prepare a working document of 1-2 typed pages describing past accomplishments as a graduate student and future goals. The student will submit an updated copy of this document to the Management department office (for distribution to all Management faculty members) prior to each spring semester evaluation session. Starting with the second year, students are required to begin writing professional vitae and submit them as part of their evaluation documents. Developmental feedback sessions, held after evaluations, will involve two faculty members of the student's choice (see #2b, below).
 - a. Listed below are the questions students should address when preparing their working document:
 1. What kind of career do you want?
 - (a) An OB, OT, HRM, or SM specialization?
 - (b) What mix of research, teaching, and service/consulting?
 2. List the accomplishments, activities, special projects, etc. completed since your last feedback review that you feel are pertinent to upcoming feedback sessions.
 3. What current activities are you engaged in? (Research, coursework, teaching, other)
 4. What future goals have you established as a student? (Research, coursework, teaching, other)
 5. Do you have any particular weaknesses that the faculty could help you remedy? What strengths do you have that you could share with other graduate students and faculty?
 6. Which two Management faculty members would you like to provide you with feedback?
 - b. Students should select two Management faculty members, who are most

familiar with their current academic performance, to conduct their developmental feedback session. The faculty members will:

1. Review the student's rate and qualities of progress in our program in specific detail, by evaluating the student's research performance, class work, teaching performance, and preparedness for research opportunities. Per Graduate School of Management requirements, a written progress evaluation document (see Appendix B) will be provided to summarize this review. A copy of this document will be provided to the student and the College Dean; one will also be placed in the student's departmental file. Optionally, the student may also place a written response to this progress evaluation in the departmental file.
2. Interactively 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.

E. Academic Integrity

Michigan State University and the Eli Broad College of Business uphold the highest standards of ethics in research and scholarship. Violation of these standards may lead to termination from the program. Students are expected to conform to the University's Guidelines for Integrity in Research and Creative Activities, which are posted at:

<http://grad.msu.edu/publications/docs/integrityresearch.pdf>

Students may also be interested in materials on the use of human subjects, conflict of interest and related topics, posted on <http://www.regaffairs.msu.edu/research/index.html>.

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.

F. Conflict Resolution

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. The procedure effective January 2005 is included in the Appendix F. This procedure includes steps that are taken at first at the program level, and then, at the college level if necessary.

G. International Travel

Graduate students traveling internationally for MSU-related work (research data collection, international professional conferences, courses, or other academic business, are strongly encouraged to sign up using the International Travelers Database (even if they are not being reimbursed for travel). This is the best way for MSU to stay in touch with our students if there is an emergency. http://www.isp.msu.edu/travel/travelers_database.htm

H. Grief Absence Policy

For master's (Plan A), master's (Plan B) with research responsibilities, and doctoral students, it is the responsibility of the student to: a) notify their advisor/major professor and faculty of the courses in which they are enrolled of the need for a grief absence in a timely manner, but no later than one week from the student's initial knowledge of the situation, b) provide appropriate verification of the grief absence as specified by the advisor/major professor and faculty, and c) complete all missed work as determined in consultation with the advisor/major professor and faculty. It is the responsibility of the advisor/major professor to: a) determine with the student the expected period of absence – it is expected that some bereavement processes may be more extensive than others depending on individual circumstances, b) receive verification of the authenticity of a grief absence request upon the student's return, and c) make reasonable accommodations so that the student is not penalized due to a verified grief absence. If employed as a RA or TE, the graduate student must also notify their employer. Both employer and student will swiftly communicate to determine how the student's responsibilities will be covered during their absence. Graduate teaching assistants (TAs) should refer to the bereavement policy in the MSU GEU CBU Article 18. Students in the graduate professional colleges (CHM, COM, CVM, LAW) with their own grief absence policies are excluded from the above and should follow their own policies. Students who believe their rights under this policy have been violated should contact the University Ombudsperson.

I. Work Related Policies

Assistantships: 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. In the first year in the doctoral program, students generally do not teach. Across their (typically) five years in the program, a student might perform a mix of TA or RA activities from year to year. However, it is not uncommon for students to sometimes have the majority of their time in the department in one role or the other. For instance, if there are fewer grant funds procured by faculty, or fewer College-level activities that can support PhD students in research or non-teaching roles, then more students will be supported in TA positions. Decisions on who is in what role are made annually by the Chairperson with considerable input from the faculty, as well as consideration of the relevance of the student's background and fit for available positions.

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 the end of each semester and at the end of the academic year. Renewal of Teaching Assistantships is contingent upon satisfactory performance in the classroom as well as satisfactory academic progress.

Teaching assistants also are governed by the agreement between the University and the Graduate Employees Union
<https://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/contracts/GEU2015-2019.pdf>

Information on health insurance options for MSU students is available from Human Resources <https://www.hr.msu.edu/benefits/studenthealth/index.htm>.

International students are required to take an English-language proficiency test (SPEAK) administered by the English Language Center www.elc.msu.edu, which also offers language instruction to teaching assistants and others seeking to improve their fluency. MSU International TAs who are not native speakers of English are required to demonstrate that they meet a minimum standard of fluency in spoken English before they can be assigned teaching work that involves oral communication with undergraduate students. TAs may meet this requirement by achieving any one of the following:

A score of 50 or higher on SPEAK, given by the English Language Center.

Taking English 097 (the ITA Speaking and Listening Class) and getting a score of 50 or higher on the ITA Oral interview (ITAOI). The ELC gives the ITAOI.

Both SPEAK and the ITA Oral Interview (ITAOI) are given free of charge to eligible students at MSU by the ELC. Students have four (4) opportunities to meet the university's requirement via SPEAK or the ITAOI. To be eligible to take SPEAK on campus, students must have regular admission and must have proof of TA status. Students who are being considered for a teaching assistantship must submit a SPEAK request form to the ELC signed by their department. Students who do not receive a sufficient score on SPEAK in a given attempt must wait at least two months before retesting. A SPEAK test practice tape and booklet (call number TAS000#25) are on reserve at the Audio Visual Library (4th floor west wing, Main Library).

Mandatory Training: All TAs and RAs must complete the on-line training about the Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct Policy. To Access the training, login to the ORA training website at: <http://goo.gl/pLh01o>. Click "Register," "Complete Registration" and then "Launch" to begin the Relationship Violence and Sexual Misconduct (RVSM) Policy - Faculty, Staff Training. (If it indicates that you have already registered, use "In Progress Training", then "Launch."). You will want to reserve approximately 30 minutes to complete all assignments. If you need assistance, contact the Helpdesk at 517-884-4600 or train@ora.msu.edu.

Office Assignments: Doctoral students are provided with office space, most typically in a 2-person private office, though some (usually first year) students may share a larger (6-person) office space. Students will typically rotate offices annually, to expose them to other students and to receive opportunities for mentoring between more senior students and more junior students. However, this attempt to effectively rotate membership in offices is complicated by several other factors, such as a desire not to move people preparing for comprehensive exams.

Additional funding: Doctoral students are encouraged to attend conferences and so efforts are made every year to provide funding that can help ensure that students can attend the conferences of relevance to their field of study.

V. THE MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE EXAM

The Management comprehensive examination (comps) is taken by each student upon completion of coursework in the Management major, usually at the start of the student's third year. Final grades must be received in all core and specialization courses prior to taking the examination. The exam is administered once yearly during the Fall semester. It consists of two sessions and is completed in two consecutive days. Session one is four hours in length and session two is five hours in length. The date(s) and times of the exam must be arranged in advance with the PhD Coordinator and Department Chairperson.

Other specifics pertaining to the comprehensive exam are as follows:

A. Structure of the Examination.

1. In the first four-hour session, students will answer eight questions.
 - a. Micro students will answer questions from Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior.
 - b. Macro students will answer questions from Strategic Management and Strategy Process.
2. In the second five-hour session, students will answer two questions. Students will choose to answer one of two questions in Research methods and one of two questions in Integration within major. The integrative question will require a response that integrates material from several different content areas within the student's chosen major (i.e., HRM, OB, or Strategy)
3. Students will be permitted to bring a one page (8 1/2 x 11) alphabetized list of references to the exam. This one-page citation sheet may include author, date, and title information only. Titles may be shortened by omitting and/or abbreviating words, but words cannot be added. No annotations or coding beyond this information will be allowed. The citation sheet must be emailed to the doctoral program director no later than one week prior to the exam. The doctoral program director will review and sign the citation sheet if it is approved. The approved, signed citation sheet will be provided to you on the day of the exam. Only approved citation sheets will be permitted during the exam.

B. Procedures Regarding the Examination.

1. In the semester of the examination, a student wishing to take the exam must:
 - a. declare his or her intent to do so, in writing, to the department chairperson and faculty member coordinating the examination, and
 - b. state, in that declaration, the area that will be considered her or his major (i.e., HRM, OB, or Strategy).
2. Grading
 - a. Students must achieve an averaged score of 3.5 across the Session 1 questions. Each question is weighted the same in computing the Session 1 average. Students must also pass each of the Session 2 questions (i.e., 3.5 or better for the research methods question and a 3.5 or better

for the integrative question). If a student fails a given part of the exam (i.e., the session 1 questions, the research methods question, or the integrative question), that part must be retaken. For example, if a student achieves a passing score on the session 1 questions and the research methods question, but fails the integrative question, that student must retake the integrative question (as opposed to the entire exam).

- b. Faculty will grade, individually, the examination items without student names attached to them using the scale shown in Appendix C. 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 obviously does not mean that anonymity is assured. Each faculty grades those items which he or she feels competent to grade and then forwards his or her grades to the faculty member selected to act as coordinator for the exam.
- c. When individual grading is complete, the faculty will meet to discuss evaluations of responses to items and reach a consensus grade for each item completed by a student.

The examining committee consists of all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Students are urged to consult prior exam questions, available in the Management Department office, before taking the exam. Students should also consult with Management faculty members; especially those who have taught the core courses, prior to the time the students begin preparing for the exam.

Students should not overlook other students who have passed comps as a source of valuable information, since the norm in our program is that students will help each other. Strategies for studying and writing answers, especially helpful papers and books, and so on, are available if students pursue them.

We emphasize that the comprehensive exam is not a "big final" that covers only material encountered in core classes. Students who take comps are assumed 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 fields of the exam.

Students normally take the exam after being in our program for two or three years, and the exam must be passed within five years of beginning the Ph.D. program. If a student fails the exam (or parts of it) on the first try, he or she may retake the exam (or any failed parts) during the next Fall semesters. Thus, a student has 12 months to retake and pass the exam. A student who fails for a second time will be permitted a third chance only after recommendation by the Management faculty, and only with approval from the Department Head. If a third exam is authorized, it must be taken within 12 months of the first 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 faculty and Department Chairperson.

Students who are terminated from the doctoral program may be eligible to earn a Master of Science in Business Research, upon successfully completing all required coursework for that degree.

VI. THE DISSERTATION

The Ph.D. dissertation is the capstone of our doctoral education program. When completed it signifies individual competence as a researcher, and, as a public document, it represents the researcher to his or her professional peers.

A. The Dissertation Committee.

A dissertation committee composed of at least four members supervises the dissertation process. The student's guidance committee must approve this committee. Selection of a chairperson is based on mutual research interests between the student and the 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 for both the student and the chairperson. The selection of faculty members for the remainder of the student's committee should be based on the potential contributions they might make to the final product.

Faculty members' decisions to chair or join a dissertation committee are based on respect for the student's ideas and competence, as demonstrated by the student's prior performance in the Management program. We look at the formation of a dissertation committee as recognition of the student's merit; in no sense is a faculty member obligated to sit on a particular student's dissertation committee.

A student wishing to have an external faculty member on their committee requires approval from the Grad School. Student and dissertation chair should submit a written request to the Department Chairperson along with a copy of the external faculty member's CV. The department submits the request to the Business Dean Office and The Graduate School for approval. The student and dissertation chair will be notified with the final decision.

The decision to pass a student's dissertation is our final certification of that student's professional competence. We take this certification seriously since the

quality of the dissertation reflects back upon the personal credibility of individual committee members as well as the quality of our program as a whole.

B. Dissertation proposal defense.

The first step in the dissertation process involves the development of a proposal indicating the research topic that a student desires 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, the committee meets with the student to decide whether to proceed to the next step. This next step, the oral defense of the Dissertation Proposal, requires the student to defend the dissertation proposal in an open meeting. Because the purpose of this requirement is to provide faculty input for the dissertation research, it should be satisfied before the majority of the research effort is undertaken. A successful defense of the dissertation proposal is achieved when three-fourths of the student's dissertation committee, including the chairperson, approves the defense. The guidance committee will report to the Doctoral Programs Office the successful completion of this requirement.

All of the members of the students' guidance committee should be in attendance at the defense of the dissertation proposal. The date, time, and place for the defense of the dissertation proposal will be announced to the Broad School faculty ten days in advance of the event.

With the exception of doctoral dissertation research credits, all course work listed on the student's approved guidance committee report must be completed with grades reported before the student will be permitted to defend the dissertation proposal.

As indicated as item #10 under "Student Expectations", faculty will not provide letters of recommendation to potential employers until the dissertation proposal has been successfully defended. This policy is intended to ensure that dissertations are proposed in a timely manner and that our students are ready for employment at the time they assume employment.

In a closed session following the defense, the committee formally votes to determine whether the student will be allowed to proceed to the next step, Ph.D. candidacy and dissertation research.

C. Final dissertation presentation.

The final oral presentation of the dissertation occurs in an open meeting when the Ph.D. candidate's dissertation committee agrees that the candidate has completed an acceptable independent research project and written it up satisfactorily. Specific policies for the conduct of the oral defense of

dissertations, the format of the dissertation, dates for submissions of the document 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 date, time, and place for the defense of the dissertation will be announced to the Broad School faculty ten days in advance of the event.

The dissertation presentation must be successfully completed within three years of passing the Management comprehensive examination and within eight years of matriculation. Candidates who fail to meet these guidelines must revert to student status, and are required, by University policy, to re-enter and pass the entire doctoral comprehensive examination process (written major and minor examinations) before proceeding further.

D. Dissertation project: A word of caution.

We have found that students often underestimate the time that is needed to form an idea for a dissertation, prepare a proposal, conduct the research and defend it. The modal 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. Two weeks to one month 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 of about two weeks. 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 about a year and a half. Consequently, a draft of the proposal should be under initial committee review no later than six to ten months after passing the comprehensive examination.

E. Electronic Submissions of Theses & Dissertations

MSU **only accepts** electronic theses and dissertations submitted via ProQuest. The instructions for electronic submissions are available from <http://grad.msu.edu/etd/>.

The target date for the **FINAL APPROVAL** of an electronic Thesis or Dissertation to the Graduate School for graduating the semester of that submission is FIVE working days prior to the first day of classes for the next semester. **Be aware that a submission via ProQuest does not mean that the document has been ACCEPTED.** The review process is interactive and final

approval can take anywhere from a few hours to weeks, depending upon the extent of the necessary revisions and how diligent the author is when making the necessary revisions.

Graduation on the semester of the electronic submission is only guaranteed if the document is APPROVED on or before the target date for that semester

VII. EXAMPLE CURRICULUM TIMETABLE

The following timetable shows two examples of course order and times taken. It is not a blueprint or even “typical”. Students should consult university course timetables to determine when the following courses will be offered. Current students and the Faculty Advisor are an excellent source of information regarding scheduling of classes. Management department seminars (900-level courses) should be taken the first time they are offered. The exact schedule will vary depending on faculty availability.

Note: Non-Management course numbers are likely to change with curriculum revisions. This scheduling assumes that the economics/behavioral analysis coursework taken (2 3-hour classes) will also count toward the minor. If this is not the case, 2 additional courses are required.

	OB/HR	Strategy
Year 1 - Fall	MGT 906 (Research Methods)	
	MGT Seminar Course	
	Minor Area Course 1	
Year 1- Spring	MGT 914 (Advanced Organizational Research Methods)	
	MGT Seminar Course	
	Minor Area Course 2	EC 421 (Intro to Econometrics)
Year 1- Summer	MGT 890 (3 credits)	
Year 2 - Fall	MGT Seminar Course	
	MSC 907 (Causal Models in Marketing)	MSC 907 --Causal Models in Marketing)
	Business concepts course 1	Minor Area Course 2
Year 2-Spring	MGT Seminar Course	
	PSY 818 (Psychometrics)	EC 823 (Applied Econometrics)
	Minor Area Course 3	Minor Area Course 3
Year 2 - Summer	MGT 890 (3 credits)	

Year 3 – Fall	Management comprehensive exam	
	MGT 890 remaining credits	
	MGT 999 (3 credits)	
	Minor Area Course 4	Minor Area Course 4
Year 3 – Spring	Dissertation Proposal Draft	
	MGT 890 remaining credits	
	MGT 999 (3 credits)	
Year 4 – Fall	Dissertation	
Year 4 - Spring	Dissertation (continue into year 5 if required)	

VIII. CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION TO CONSORTIA

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

A. Performance as a Student.

1. Doing well in course work.
2. Making steady progress toward degree.
3. Most important, active involvement in research (i.e., publications, revise-and-resubmits, manuscripts under review).

B. Career Stage and Interest.

1. Being about 2/3 of the way through coursework (i.e., after 2-3 years).
2. Evidence of advanced student interest in consortium topic.

It is not always the case that one or more students will be sent to consortia by the Department each year. The final decision is made by the Management faculty and is based upon whether one or more students have met the criteria for attendance. An individual may be invited to participate in one consortium one year and another in another year. However, no one will be sent to the same consortium twice.

All of these criteria are subject to budgetary constraints.

IX. EXIT SURVEYS:

A new short online exit survey for all students graduating with a Plan A or Plan B masters or with a Doctoral degree was introduced May 9th of 2011. Only students who have applied for graduation will have access to the survey. The survey asks questions about educational experiences in MSU graduate programs, as well as about immediate professional plans. The Graduate School uses data from this survey when reviewing graduate programs and to guide decisions about services and initiatives for graduate students.

The identity of all respondents will be kept confidential and only aggregate (group) information will be made available to faculty and administrators. The students will receive an e-mail message from the dean of the graduate school with a link to the survey. However, students do not need to wait for that e-mail message to complete the survey after applying for graduation. It takes about 5-10 minutes to complete the online survey. Below are the instructions for completing the survey and they are also available from <http://grad.msu.edu/etd/>

Instructions for students:

- Access the following website:
 - Doctoral Students: <https://www.egr.msu.edu/doctoral/survey/>
 - Master's Students: <https://www.egr.msu.edu/masters/survey/>
- Enter your MSU NetID (Login Name) and Password
- Complete all the items on the survey. When finished, click **Submit**.

If you cannot open this survey, please contact Katey Smagur by email at smagurka@msu.edu, and include your name, student ID #, degree level (PhD, MA/MS) and semester of graduation. You will then be notified when you are able to complete the survey.

X. THE FACULTY

The faculty of the Management program have diverse interests which, when supplemented by the interests of other faculty on campus, provide students with an unusually broad educational opportunity.

DONALD E. CONLON. Gambrel Family Endowed Professor. Dr. Conlon received his Ph.D. in business administration from the organizational behavior group at the University of Illinois. His research (which examines justice issues in organizations, negotiation and third party dispute intervention, and decision making) has been

published in a variety of journals, including the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, and the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. He has also received "Best paper" awards from both the Academy of Management and the International Association for Conflict Management. He has served as the President of the International Association for Conflict Management, and is a past Division Chair for the Conflict Management Division of the Academy of Management. He has served or currently serves on numerous editorial boards including the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, the *Journal of Management*, the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, and *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. Professor Conlon's teaching interests lie in the areas of organizational behavior and negotiation/dispute resolution.

LANCE FERRIS. Associate Professor. Dr. Ferris is an Associate Professor in the Department of Management at the Eli Broad College of Business at Michigan State University. Prior to joining Broad, Lance was an Assistant Professor at the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University from 2008-2011, and an Associate Professor at the Smeal College of Business at the Pennsylvania State University from 2011-2017. His research focuses on motivation (particularly self-enhancement/self-verification, approach/avoidance, self-control, and self-determination theory models of motivation) and bad behavior (e.g., abusive supervision, ostracism, incivility). He currently serves on the editorial board of *Academy of Management Journal* and *Journal of Applied Psychology*. His work has been published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Annals*, *Organization Science*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, and *Personnel Psychology*.

HE GAO. Assistant Professor. Dr. Gao received her Ph.D. in Strategic Management from Arizona State University. Her research is centered on the strategic use of language, competitive dynamics, and strategic leadership. She is particularly interested in how top managers use language to influence stakeholders and competitors. Her research has been published in *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Management*, and *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings*.

SHELBY GAI. Assistant Professor. Dr. Gai is an Assistant Professor of Management at Michigan State University. Her research focuses on board design – a subfield of organizational design that emphasizes how to design a company's board of directors to align with the organization's strategic goals. In her dissertation, she examines how formal and informal structures of publicly listed US boards as well as varying governance configurations of Hong Kong family businesses affect both board- and firm-level outcomes.

Her work has received awards like the 2018 Andreas Al-Laham Best Paper Award from the Multi-Level Network Research Standing Working Group at the European

Group for Organizational Studies (EGOS), and was nominated for the 2019 Best Paper Proceedings from the Strategy Division of the Academy of Management.

Shelby graduated with an M.A. and Ph.D. in Management and Organizations from Northwestern University's Kellogg School of Management. She also has an M.S. in Statistics from Northwestern as well as a M.A. from the Wharton School, where she researched changes in Hong Kong's board independence regulations using an institutional lens. Shelby graduated magna cum laude from Princeton University with an A.B. in Sociology and a certificate in East Asian Studies. During college, she researched topics related to race and ethnicity.

Before entering academia, Shelby worked in the Financial Services and Board Services Practices at the executive search firm Spencer Stuart in both their New York and Shanghai offices. As the Junior Knowledge Manager in the Board Services Practice, she spearheaded research efforts that culminated in the first Hong Kong Board Index.

NICHOLAS HAYS. Associate Professor. Dr. Hays received his Ph.D. in Organizational Behavior from UCLA, and his B.A. in Psychology and B.S. in Economics from the University of Pennsylvania. His research examines the psychology of hierarchy, specifically how power and status hierarchies, the most prevalent forms of social hierarchy, affect individuals' experiences and group processes. His research has been published in *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Organization Science*, the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, the *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *Current Opinion in Psychology*, and *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. Prior to MSU, Dr. Hays was a Visiting Assistant Professor at NYU's Stern School of Business.

JOHN R. HOLLENBECK. Professor. Dr. Hollenbeck holds the positions of University Distinguished Professor at Michigan State University and Eli Broad Professor of Management at the Eli Broad Graduate School of Business Administration. Dr. Hollenbeck received his Ph.D. in Management from New York University in 1984. He served as the acting editor at *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* in 1995, the associate editor of *Decision Sciences* from 1999 to 2004, and the editor of *Personnel Psychology* from 1996 to 2002. He has published over 80 articles and book chapters on the topics of team decision-making and work motivation. According to the Institute for Scientific Information, this body of work has been cited over 2,500 times by other researchers. Dr. Hollenbeck has been awarded over \$6 million in external research funding, most of which was granted by the Office of Naval Research and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. Along with Daniel R. Ilgen, he founded the Michigan State University Team Effectiveness Research Laboratory, and this facility has been dedicated to conducting large sample team research since 1991. Dr. Hollenbeck has been awarded fellowship status in both the Academy of Management and the American Psychological Association, and was recognized with the Career Achievement

Award by the HR Division of the Academy of Management (2011) and the Early Career Award by the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (1992). At Michigan State, Dr. Hollenbeck has won several teaching awards including the Michigan State Distinguished Faculty Award, the Michigan State Teacher-Scholar Award, and the Broad MBA Most Outstanding Faculty Member.

RUSSELL E. JOHNSON. MSU Foundation Professor. Dr. Johnson is an MSU Foundation Professor of management in the Eli Broad College of Business at Michigan State University. Previously, he was a member of the faculty at the University of South Florida. He received his Ph.D. in Industrial and Organizational Psychology from the University of Akron in 2006. His research examines the roles of motivation-, justice-, and leadership-based processes that underlie work attitudes and behaviors. He has published over one hundred research articles in numerous peer-reviewed journals, including *Academy of Management Annals*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Psychological Bulletin*, and *Research in Organizational Behavior*, among others. His research has been cited in popular press outlets such as *Forbes*, *The Globe and Mail*, *Harvard Business Review*, *NBC's Today*, *NPR*, *Psychology Today*, *TIME*, and *Wall Street Journal*. He is currently an associate editor at *Journal of Applied Psychology*, past associate editor and guest editor at *Academy of Management Review*, and serves on the editorial boards at *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *The Leadership Quarterly*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, and *Personnel Psychology*, among others. In 2013, Dr. Johnson received the Distinguished Early Career Contributions Award for Science from the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and in 2018 he received the Cummings Scholarly Achievement Award from the Organizational Behavior Division of Academy of Management.

CHRISTY ZHOU KOVAL. Assistant Professor. Dr. Koval received her Ph.D. in Management and Organizations from the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University, and her H.B.A. in Business Administration and M.Sc. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from the University of Western Ontario. Her research focuses on diversity and inclusion in the workplace, stereotyping and bias, and intergroup relations. Her work has been published in *Leadership Quarterly*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *Psychological Science*, and *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. She has won the Dorothy Harlow Best Paper Award and was a runner-up for the Saroj Parasuraman Outstanding Publication Award at the Academy of Management GDO division. Prior to MSU, she was a faculty member of the Management department at the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Business School.

GERRY M. MCNAMARA. Eli Broad Professor of Management. Dr. McNamara is a professor of management at Michigan State University. Previously, he was a member of the faculty at the University of California, Riverside and the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota.

His research focuses on examining the effects of behavioral factors, organizational practices, and strategic positioning on organizational decision-making and risk taking. His research has been published in the *Academy of Management Journal*, the *Strategic Management Journal*, *Organization Science*, the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, the *Journal of Management*, and the *Journal of International Business Studies*. His research on mergers and acquisitions has been abstracted in the *Wall Street Journal*, *New York Times*, *Economist*, *Harvard Business Review Daily Stat*, and *Business Week*.

He is a co-author of the textbook *Strategic Management: Creating Competitive Advantages* with Greg Dess and Alan Eisner. Additionally, he has been honored as the JMI Scholar of the Year by the Western Academy of Management. He currently serves as an Associate Editor for the *Strategic Management Journal* and served as an Associate Editor for the *Academy of Management Journal* from 2010-2013.

KENT D. MILLER. Professor and Department Chairperson. Professor Miller teaches strategic management courses for full-time and executive MBA students. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. Prior to joining the MSU faculty, he taught at Purdue University (Krannert), the German International Graduate School of Management and Administration (GISMA), and New York University (Stern).

Professor Miller studies organizational learning and strategic change, as well as methodological and philosophical issues in management and organization studies. His research encompasses empirical, theoretical, and modeling work. Some projects develop computer simulation models to explore social learning processes and their implications for organizations. He has authored over forty academic research articles.

He is a member of the Academy of Management and Strategic Management Society. He serves on the editorial boards of *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *Strategic Management Journal*, and *Strategic Organization*.

FREDERICK P. MORGESON. Eli Broad Professor of Management. As an industrial and organizational psychologist (Ph.D., Purdue University), Dr. Morgeson studies how organizations can optimally identify, select, develop, manage, and retain talent to achieve their strategic goals. For over 20 years, Dr. Morgeson has conducted award-winning research, taught, and consulted across a range of topics, including leadership, teams, work design, and personnel selection. As one of the most prolific and highly cited scholars in the world, Dr. Morgeson's research has

been ground-breaking and pioneering. This includes nearly 90 publications, with half of these publications appearing in top-tier academic journals. This work has had a significant impact on the field, with over 21,000 total citations to this research in Google Scholar (as of 2018). In recognition of this impact, Dr. Morgeson has been awarded Fellow status from leading professional associations, including the Academy of Management, American Psychological Association, the Association for Psychological Science, and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. He has also worked with over 60 public and private sector organizations spanning a diverse set of industries, including healthcare, insurance, manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, military, and governmental agencies. Dr. Morgeson is the founding and current Editor of the *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, former Editor of *Personnel Psychology*, editorial board member of the *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, and *Organizational Psychology Review*, and the former Chair of the Academy of Management Human Resources Division. Finally, Dr. Morgeson is a highly-respected thought leader who has been featured in national and international media publications, including *ABC News*, *Bloomberg Businessweek*, *Business Insider*, *National Public Radio*, *Reuters*, and *Wall Street Journal*, sharing his insights on human resource management, leadership, and more.

QUINETTA ROBERSON. John A. Hannah Distinguished Professor of Management and Psychology. Dr. Roberson is the John A. Hannah Distinguished Professor of Management and Psychology at Michigan State University. Prior to her current position, she was an endowed chair at Villanova University and a tenured professor at Cornell University. She has also been a visiting scholar at universities on every continent, except for Antarctica, and served an appointment as Program Director of the Science of Organizations at the National Science Foundation (NSF). She currently serves as President of the Academy of Management (AOM) for 2020-2021.

Professor Roberson's research interests focus on developing organizational capability and enhancing effectiveness through the strategic management of people, particularly diverse work teams. Her research has appeared in such journals as the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Academy of Management Annals*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Organizational Research Methods* and *Personnel Psychology*. Professor Roberson was an Associate Editor at the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (2008-2014), and edited a *Handbook of Diversity in the Workplace* published by Oxford Press.

Professor Roberson has over 20 years of experience teaching courses and workshops globally on leadership, talent management and diversity. Her research and teaching are informed by her background in finance, having worked as a financial analyst and small business development consultant prior to obtaining her doctorate. Dr. Roberson has also served as an expert witness in employment

discrimination lawsuits, and provides professional advice and guidance to for-profit and non-profit organizations.

GUY SHANI. Assistant Professor.

BRENT SCOTT. Frederick S. Addy Endowed Distinguished Professor. Dr. Scott received his Ph.D. in Business Administration from the University of Florida and his B.A. in Psychology from Miami University (OH). His research focuses on the role of mood and emotions at work, organizational justice, and well-being. Dr. Scott's research has been published in journals including *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Journal of Management*, and *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, and he has received funding for his research from the National Science Foundation. Dr. Scott's research also has appeared in various media outlets including the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, CBS, USA Today, Forbes, and BBC. A Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) Fellow, Dr. Scott was the 2015 recipient of the Academy of Management's Cummings Scholarly Achievement Award and the 2014 recipient of SIOP's Distinguished Early Career Contributions Award (Science). He also received the Broad College's Withrow Endowed Teacher-Scholar Award in 2018 and the Withrow Endowed Emerging Scholar Award in 2011.

Dr. Scott served as an Associate Editor for *Academy of Management Journal*, and he currently serves on the editorial boards of *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, and *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

JAMAL SHAMSIE. Associate Professor. Dr. Shamsie received his Ph.D. in the area of strategic management from McGill University. His current research draws on the resource-based view, organizational capabilities and strategic learning. Dr. Shamsie has published in *Strategic Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *Organization Science* and *Journal of Management*. He has also won an award with Danny Miller for the best paper in *Academy of Management Journal*. Dr. Shamsie's research has also focused on the entertainment sector. He has organized conferences and edited a special issue of *Organization Science* on this topic. He has recently edited a book of readings on strategic issues that are confronting various entertainment and media industries.

JOHN A WAGNER III. Professor. Dr. Wagner received his Ph.D. in Business Administration from the University of Illinois, Urbana. His primary research interests concern organizational behavior and organization theory, and include research on the effects of size, participation, and collectivism on performance and cooperation in the workplace. Professor Wagner has published in journals such as the *Administrative Science Quarterly*, the *Academy of Management Journal*, the *Academy of Management Review*, and *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. He is an associate editor of the *Administrative Science*

Quarterly and has served on the editorial board of the *Academy of Management Review*. Professor Wagner belongs to the Academy of Management and the Decision Sciences Institute. He was a recipient, in 1989, of the Scholarly Achievement Award given by the Human Resources Division of the Academy of Management, and in 1993 he received the Walter de Gruyter Best Paper Award presented by the Academy of Management's Research Methods Division. He is also a recipient of the John D. and Dortha J. Withrow Endowed Teacher-Scholar Award.

ROBERT WISEMAN. Professor, Broad Legacy Fellow and Senior Associate Dean. Dr. Wiseman received his M.B.A. from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in 1982, and his Ph.D. in strategic management from the University of Minnesota in 1992. Before joining Michigan State University, he was an assistant professor at Arizona State University. Dr. Wiseman's current research interests are strategic risk and decision making; executive compensation and corporate governance. His research on strategic risk taking and executive compensation has been published in the *Academy of Management Journal*, the *Academy of Management Review*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Organization Science*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*. He has served on the editorial boards of the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Strategic Management Journal*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Strategy and Management*, and *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, and has won several distinguished reviewer awards from the Academy of Management.

XI. 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. MSU is committed to achieving excellence through cultural diversity. The university actively encourages applications and/or nominations of women, persons of color, veterans and persons with disabilities.

B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

For information about your academic rights and responsibilities as a graduate student, refer to the Graduate Student Handbook-
<http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/>

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 www.msu.edu/user/gradschl/
Student Handbook and Resource Guide..... <http://splife.studentlife.msu.edu/>

Human Resources www.hr.msu.edu/
including MSU policies on: Doctoral Program Guidance Committee, composition;
The
Code of Teaching Responsibility; Health Care Coverage; Student Handbooks

Graduate Employees Union contract
..... <https://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/contracts/GEU2015-2019.pdf>

The Eli Broad College of Business www.broad.msu.edu/

Academic Programs - Graduate Study www.reg.msu.edu/AcademicPrograms/
MSU Library www.lib.msu.edu/

Phone Numbers

Athletic Ticket Office	(517) 355-1610
Breslin Student Events Center Ticket Office	(517) 432-5000
Financial Aid Office	(517) 353-5940
Resource Center for Persons with Disabilities	(517) 884-7273
Library (Business)	(517) 355-3380
Library (Main)	(517) 353-8700
Fee Classification (In State/Out State)	(517) 432-3488
MSU Help Line	(517) 353-4MSU or (800) 496-4MSU
College of Business Network Resource Center	(517) 353-1646
Public Safety Department (Parking)	(517) 355-8440
Registrar's Office.....	(517) 355-3300
Student Accounts Office (Fees, Sponsored Aid & Fellowships).....	(517) 355-5050
Wharton Center Ticket Office	(800) 942-7866 or (517) 432-2000
Transcripts	(517) 353-3300

XII. LIST OF APPENDICES

- A. Report of the Guidance Committee Form -- Doctoral Program.**
- B. Management Student Progress Evaluation Form.**
- C. Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria.**
- D. Code of Teaching Responsibility.**
- E. Department of Management Academic Hearing Procedure**
- F. The Eli Broad College of Business Grievance Procedure**

APPENDIX A

Report of the Guidance Committee Form -- Doctoral Program.

Copies to: Dean
Department
Guidance Committee
Student

REPORT OF THE GUIDANCE COMMITTEE – DOCTORAL AND OTHER PROGRAMS

See the catalog (Academic Programs) regarding composition of guidance committee and deadlines for its formation and for filing this report listing all degree requirements.

Name _____ Student No. _____ Ph.D. D.M.A.
Last First Middle Ed.D. Ed.S.

First Semester in Doctoral Program _____ Dept. _____ Major _____
Semester Year

Bachelor of _____ Master of _____
Institution Year Major Institution Year Major

Tentative Dissertation Subject _____

Director _____ Languages or Course Substitutes _____

Will the student's research involve the use of: human subjects or human materials? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No warm-blooded animals? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No or hazardous substances? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	I understand it is necessary to obtain institutional review and approval prior to initiating any research involving the use of human or animal subjects or hazardous materials. (STUDENT'S SIGNATURE) _____ Mo/Day/Yr
---	--

DOCTORAL PROGRAM

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE AND CLUSTER BY FIELD

Dept.	Course No.	Semester	Title	No. CR	Dept.	Course No.	Semester	Title	No. CR

Approved:
(Please TYPE guidance committee members' names BELOW signatures)

- _____, Chairperson Mo/Day/Yr
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Course Credits (in addition to at least 24 credits of 999) _____

Comprehensive examination areas:

 The candidate expects to pass the Comprehensive Examination by _____ Semester, _____ (Year).

 Student _____ Mo/Day/Yr
 Department Chairperson _____ Mo/Day/Yr
 College Dean _____ Mo/Day/Yr

APPENDIX B

**Management Student Progress
Evaluation Form**

Broad College of Business PhD Student Progress Evaluation Form (revised 2/12/2014)

Student Name: _____ Time period of evaluation: _____

Student's Signature and Date of Receipt: _____

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

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	N/A	Unaccept-able	Below Expect-ations	Meets Expect-ations	Exceeds Expect-ations
COURSEWORK					
Performance in major courses					
Performance in other courses					
Comprehensive exam					
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*					

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

Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria

Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria

← Not Passing → Passing					
1	2	3	4	5	6
<p>Just plain B.S.</p> <p>Would be better various Blank.</p> <p>Response painfully padded with details. covers</p>	<p>Obviously unfamiliar with area content.</p> <p>Student does not adequately know the material.</p> <p>Misses most important points.</p> <p>Did not understand the question or the topic.</p> <p>Lack of acquaintance with the literature.</p> <p>Misses many Important points</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</p> <p>sources to bear problem.</p> <p>A well organized answer that</p> <p>all major points.</p> <p>Organized before writing and supplemented with cited research.</p>

APPENDIX D

Code of Teaching Responsibility

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.
 - Any required proctoring arrangements to which students must adhere.
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.

Assessment methods should be appropriate to the learning objectives of the course. In that context, instructors are expected to take reasonable steps to create an assessment environment that promotes academic integrity. When proctoring or other security measures are necessary to ensure integrity of assessments, then such measures should be administered in a manner consistent with the design and delivery of the course.

<http://www.reg.msu.edu/AcademicPrograms/Print.asp?Section=514>

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.

APPENDIX E

Department of Management Graduate Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures

Department of Management at Michigan State University

Graduate Student Academic Grievance Hearing Procedures

For the Organizational Behavior/Human Resource Management; Strategic Management; and Management, Strategy, and Leadership 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 **Department of Management** has established the following Hearing Board procedures for adjudicating graduate student academic grievances and complaints. (See GSRR 5.4.)

I. JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF 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;
 - 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;

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.)
 4. send the Hearing Board members a copy of the request for a hearing and the 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 vice 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, hear the case in the respondent's absence, or dismiss the case. (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 a "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 a "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, 5.4.12.3, and 5.5.2.2)

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 the "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.)

Revised and approved by Department of Management on March 27, 2015
Revised and approved by Department of Management on February 21, 2012
Revised and approved by Department of Management on November 6, 2011
Approved by Department of Management Faculty on January 19, 2011

APPENDIX F

The Eli Broad College of Business - Grievance Procedure (adopted April 26, 2002)

In accordance with the provisions of the Academic Freedom Report (AFR) and the Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR) document for students at Michigan State University, The Eli Broad College of Business and The Eli Broad Graduate School of Management has established the following procedure for the receipt and consideration of student academic complaints (see the document updated on April 26, 2002):

1. COMPLAINT TO UNIT ADMINISTRATOR

- 1.1 If problems arise in the relationship between instructor and student, both should attempt to resolve them in informal, direct discussions (AFR 2.4.2 and GSRR 5.3.1). If the problem remains unresolved, then the student should consult the unit administrator (the Departmental Chairperson or School Director) of the instructional staff member concerned. The University Ombudsman may be consulted as well. If the unit administrator is unable to resolve the dispute, the student may then submit a formal written grievance for consideration by an appropriate unit hearing board. The formal grievance alleging violations of academic rights must include a proposed remedy that could be implemented by the unit administrator (AFR 2.4.2 and GSRR 5.3.2)
- 1.2 Grievances must normally be initiated no later than mid-semester of the semester following the one wherein the alleged violation of academic rights occurred (exclusive of summer semester). If the involved instructor or student is absent from the University during that semester, or if other appropriate reasons exist, an exception to this provision may be granted by the appropriate hearing board. If, before the formal grievance procedures are completed, the involved instructor is no longer employed by the University, the grievance process may nevertheless proceed. (AFR 2.4.2.1 and GSRR 5.3.6.1)
- 1.3 A student who receives a penalty grade based upon a charge of academic dishonesty and who is not referred for judicial action may seek a hearing from an academic unit hearing board. In such a hearing, the burden of proof shall rest upon the instructor whose prior assignment of the penalty grade will constitute a charge of academic dishonesty. (GSRR 5.5.2)
- 1.4 Individual units of the College may have their own unit grievance procedures so long as they are consistent with the AFR and the GSRR. If an individual unit does not formally adopt its own procedure, then the procedure in this document shall be followed.

2. REFERRAL TO ACADEMIC UNIT COMMITTEE

- 2.1 Upon receipt of a request for a grievance hearing, the unit administrator shall

- promptly refer the matter, including a copy of the original complaint, to the chairperson of the appropriate unit hearing board. Upon receipt of a formal grievance, the chairperson of the hearing board shall transmit a copy of the grievance within ten (10) class days to the hearing board members and to the person or persons party to the matter. (AFR 2.4.2.3 and GSRR 5.4.3)
- 2.2 The unit hearing board shall be composed of three faculty and three students selected by their respective (undergraduate or graduate) groups, and in accordance with University, College and unit bylaws. (AFR 2.4.3 and GSRR 5.1) The unit administrator shall designate one of the faculty members to serve as chairperson of the hearing board. The chairperson of the hearing board shall record and administer the proceedings and organize the preparation of the report summarizing the findings of the board. The unit administrator may serve as an ex officio member of the hearing board without vote. No one involved in the case may serve on the hearing board. (GSRR 5.1.2 and 5.1.7)
 - 2.3 The unit hearing board shall review each student complaint and forward a copy of the request for a hearing to the appropriate individual(s) and invite a written response (GSRR 5.4.12.4). After considering all submitted information, the hearing board may:
 - a) Decide that sufficient reasons for a hearing do not exist and dismiss the grievance;
 - b) Decide that sufficient reasons for a hearing exist and accept the request, in full or in part, and proceed to schedule a hearing.
 - 2.4 Hearings shall be scheduled within ten (10) class days of the decision of the unit hearing board to hear a grievance. At least three (3) class days prior to a formal hearing, the respondent and the complainant shall be notified by the chairperson of the hearing board of the time and place of the hearing and the names of the parties to the grievance, hearing panel members, witnesses, and counsels. (AFR 2.4.4 and GSRR 5.4.7)
 - 2.5 Attendance at the hearing shall be limited to the hearing panel, the student complainant, the instructional staff member concerned (the respondent), and any witnesses called by the student or instructor. Each party to the grievance may be accompanied by a counsel of their choice who may assist in the preparation of their case. Involvement of counsel should normally not be required. When present, counsel shall be limited to a member of the student body, faculty, or staff of the University. (AFR 2.4.4.2 and GSRR 5.4.10) The unit administrator, the Dean, or the Dean's designee also may attend as observers.
 - 2.6 Following the hearing, the chairperson of the unit hearing board shall prepare a written report of findings and rationale for the decision and shall forward copies to the parties involved, the responsible administrator(s), the Ombudsman, and the Dean of the College within ten (10) class days. If the student is in a graduate program, the report shall also be sent to the Dean of The Graduate School. The report shall indicate the major elements of evidence, or lack thereof, that support the hearing board's decision. All recipients are expected to respect the confidentiality of this report. When a hearing board finds that a

violation of academic rights has occurred and that redress is possible, it shall direct the unit administrator to provide redress. The unit administrator, in consultation with the hearing board, shall implement an appropriate remedy. (AFR 2.4.5 and GSRR 5.4.11)

3. APPEALS

- 3.1 Either party to a grievance may appeal a decision of the departmental/school hearing board to the College hearing board. Undergraduate students whose initial hearing took place at the college level may appeal to the Academic Integrity Review Board, which is housed in the Provost's Office. Graduate students whose initial hearing took place at the college level may appeal to the University Graduate Judiciary, which is housed in the Graduate School. Appeals must be filed within ten (10) class days following notice of a decision. The original decision shall be held in abeyance while under appeal. (AFR 2.4.7.3 and GSRR 5.4.12 and 5.4.12.3)
- 3.2 Appeals must allege either that applicable procedures for adjudicating the case were not followed in the previous hearing or that the findings of the unit hearing board were not supported by the preponderance of the evidence. Presentation of new evidence will normally be inappropriate at an appeal hearing. (AFR 2.4.7 though 2.4.7.3 and GSRR 5.4.12 through 5.4.12.4.1).
- 3.3 All appeals must be written and signed and must specify the alleged defects in the previous adjudication(s) in sufficient particularity to justify further proceedings. The appeal must also specify the redress that is sought. (GSRR 5.4.12.2)
- 3.4 The College hearing board shall be composed of three faculty and three students. One of the faculty members shall serve as chairperson of the College hearing board and shall record and administer the proceedings and organize the preparation of the report summarizing the findings of the board. No one involved in the case may serve on the hearing board.
 - a) Faculty representatives to undergraduate hearings shall include the Chairperson of the Undergraduate Programs Committee or designee, who also shall serve as chair. Student representatives to undergraduate hearings shall be selected by the Undergraduate Student Senate of the College.
 - b) Faculty representatives to graduate hearings shall include the Chairperson of the appropriate College graduate committee (either the Masters Programs Committee or the Doctoral Programs Committee) or designee, who also shall serve as chair. Student representatives to graduate hearings shall be selected by the Graduate Student Advisory Council of the College. (GSRR 5.1.3)
- 3.5 The College hearing board shall review each appeal request and forward a copy of the request to the appropriate individual(s) and invite a written response (GSRR 5.4.12.4). After considering all submitted information and within ten (10) class days of the appeal request, the College hearing board may:

- a) Decide that sufficient reasons for an appeal do not exist and that the decision of the lower hearing body shall stand;
 - b) Direct the lower hearing body to rehear the case or to reconsider or clarify its decision; or
 - c) Decide that sufficient reasons exist for an appeal and accept the request, in full or in part, and proceed to schedule an appeal hearing.
- 3.6 Appeal hearings shall be scheduled within ten (10) class days of the decision of the College hearing board to hear an appeal. At least three (3) class days prior to a formal hearing, the respondent and the complainant shall be notified by the chairperson of the hearing board of the time and place of the hearing and the names of the parties to the grievance, hearing panel members, witnesses, and counsels. (AFR 2.4.4 and GSRR 5.4.7)
- 3.7 Attendance at the hearing is limited to the committee, the student complainant, the instructional staff member concerned, and any witnesses called by the student or instructor. Each party to the grievance may be accompanied by a counsel of their choice who may assist in the preparation of their case. Involvement of counsel should normally not be required. When present, counsel shall be limited to a member of the student body, faculty, or staff of the University. (AFR 2.4.4.2 and GSRR 4.4.8) The Dean or the Dean's designee also may attend as observers.
- 3.8 Following an appeal hearing, the College hearing board may affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the unit hearing body. (GSRR 5.4.12.4.1) The chairperson of the College hearing board shall prepare a written report of findings and rationale for the decision and shall forward copies to the parties involved, to the responsible administrator(s), and to the Ombudsman within ten (10) class days of the resolution of the appeal. If the student is in a graduate program, the report shall also be sent to the Dean of The Graduate School. The report shall indicate the major elements of evidence, or lack thereof, that support the College hearing board's decision. All recipients are expected to respect the confidentiality of this report. (AFR 2.4.5 and GSRR 5.4.11)
- 3.9 When a College hearing board finds that a violation of academic rights has occurred and that redress is possible, it shall direct the Dean of the College or the Dean's designate to provide redress. The administrator, in consultation with the hearing board, shall implement an appropriate remedy. (AFR 2.2.4 and 2.4.5; GSRR 5.4.11).

4. PROCEDURE FOR HEARINGS WITHIN THE COLLEGE

- 4.1 Hearing boards shall ensure that a collegial atmosphere prevails in grievance hearings.
- 4.2 At the appointed time and place the chairperson of the hearing board shall convene the hearing. The chairperson of the hearing board will establish time limits for the presentation of arguments and make a record of the proceedings. The procedure that will be followed in the hearing proper is as follows:

- Introduction of the hearing panel and statement of the issue by the chairperson of panel
- Presentation by the complainant or complainant's counsel
- Questions of complainant by respondent or his/her counsel
- Questions of complainant} by members of the hearing panel
- Presentation by each of complainant's witnesses
- Questions of each of complainant's witnesses by respondent
- Questions of each of complainant's witnesses by members of the hearing panel
- Presentation by respondent
- Questions of respondent by complainant
- Questions of respondent by members of the hearing panel
- Presentation by each of respondent's witnesses
- Questions of each of respondent's witnesses by complainant's
- Questions of each of respondent's witnesses by members of the hearing panel
- Questions of complainant, respondent, or witnesses by hearing board members
- Final summary by complainant
- Final summary by respondent and/or his/her counsel
- Final questions of complainant, respondent, or witnesses by hearing board members
- Summary of the issue as clarified in the hearing by chairperson of panel
- Panel members meet in Executive Session. Agreement of a majority of those voting is necessary to sustain the grievance, and, if applicable, to recommend a remedy. If it appears necessary, the committee may, prior to reaching a decision, recess and then continue the hearing at a later date so that appropriate witnesses may be called to help determine matters of fact.