

MANAGEMENT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND DOCTORAL STUDENT MANUAL

Michigan State University
Department of Management
Revised April 2016

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	7
2. The minor	7
3. Independent Study (MGT 890)	8
C. Development of Research Competence	8
1. Coursework.....	8
2. Management 890 (Independent Study)	9
3. Independent Empirical Research Proposal	9
D. Competence in Economics and/ Behavioral Analysis	9
E. Competence in Business Concepts	10
F. Course Requirement Summary.....	10
IV. EXPECTATIONS, ADVICE, AND FEEDBACK.....	11
A. Faculty Expectations for Doctoral Students	12
B. Student Advisor for New Graduate Students	13
C. Faculty Advisor for New Graduate Students	13
D. Feedback to Graduate Students	14
E. Academic Integrity.....	16
F. Conflict Resolution	16
G. Work-Related Policies.....	16
V. THE MANAGEMENT COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION.....	17
A. Structure of the Examination.....	18
B. Procedures Regarding the Examination.....	18
VI. THE DISSERTATION	20
A. The Dissertation Committee.....	20
B. Dissertation Proposal Defense.....	21
C. Final Dissertation Presentation	21
D. Dissertation Project: A Word of Caution	22
E. Electronic Submissions of Theses and Dissertations	22
VII. EXAMPLE CURRICULUM TIMETABLE	23
VIII. CRITERIA FOR NOMINATION TO CONSORTIA	24
A. Performance as a Student	24
B. Career Stage and Interest.....	25

IX.	EXIT SURVEYS.....	25
X.	THE FACULTY	26
XI.	UNIVERSITY RESOURCES.....	33
	A. Equal Opportunity, Non-Discrimination & Affirmative Action	33
	B. Student Rights and Responsibilities.....	33
	C. Library Resources	33
	D. Useful Contacts.....	34
XII.	LIST OF APPENDICES	35
	A. Report of the Guidance Committee -- Doctoral Program	36
	B. Management Student Progress Evaluation Form	38
	C. Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria	40
	D. Code of Teaching Responsibility.....	42
	E. Academic Hearing Procedure	46
	F. Grievance Procedure	56

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. Combined 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/>

2. College transcripts showing grades received while pursuing all prior undergraduate degrees as well as graduate degrees, if any. Official copies should be sent directly to the Department of Management.

Office of Admissions will accept the following as certified copies:

- i. Copy is notarized with name/stamp/seal/date and submitted by the applicant in a sealed envelope.
 - ii. Copy of the original is attached to a MSU faculty written translation signed and dated by faculty member when original is not in English.
 - iii. Copy is stamped 'true copy' or 'duplicate' by the international institution (must be in sealed envelope).
 - iv. The original is viewed by a MSU department employee. The employee makes a copy and stamps the copy 'compared with original'. The applicant and employee must both sign and date the copy.
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.
 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. Specific entrance criteria change from year to year, but it is generally the case that an applicant will not be accepted if his/her GMAT cumulative score is lower than the 85th percentile.

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. BASIC COURSE 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

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 (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 seminar 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. By the end of the first year, each student should design an empirical research study and describe this design in a research proposal. The proposal should include a thorough literature review on the topic of interest, development of hypotheses, a methods section detailing how the study will be put together, and an appropriate bibliography/reference section. The proposal may include material contained in papers used to fulfill previous course requirements, but it must be original.

This independent study should be taken under one faculty member. The faculty member must be satisfied that the empirical 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.
Minor:	3-4 courses (12 credit hours) in a field related to Management.
Independent Study:	At least six semester hours of MGT 890, cannot take more than 9 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).

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.

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, 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 curriculum, presented in the order normally experienced by students.

A. 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., 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.

B. 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>

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.

C. 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. For first year students, there will be a scheduled informal session held at the beginning of the Spring semester with the department chairperson, 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 distribute an updated copy of this document 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.

D. 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.

E. 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 E **F**. This procedure includes steps that are taken at first at the program level, and then, at the college level if necessary.

F. Work Related Policies

Most doctoral students in the College receive a graduate assistantship, with duties that may include teaching or research performed under the supervision of a faculty member. Graduate assistants are expected to fulfill their assigned responsibilities at a high level of performance. For more information regarding the rights and responsibilities of graduate students at MSU, refer to “Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities” www.vps.msu.edu/SpLife/.

The performance of graduate assistants involved in teaching is formally evaluated at 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
<http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/contracts/GEU2011-2015.pdf>

Information on health insurance options for MSU students is available from Human Resources <http://www.hr.msu.edu/students.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 (ITAOL). The ELC gives the ITAOL.

Both SPEAK and the ITA Oral Interview (ITAOL) 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 ITAOL. 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).

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 may be administered twice yearly, during Fall semester and during Spring semester, per student request and faculty consent. It consists of two sessions and may be completed in one day or in two consecutive days, depending on the preference of the majority of students taking the exam. 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. Students majoring in OB/HR will answer eight questions, four drawn from material in the HR seminar, and four drawn from material in the OB seminar. Students majoring in Strategy will answer eight questions, four drawn from material in the strategy content seminar, and four drawn from material in the strategy process seminar. The intent of these questions is to have students demonstrate mastery of the material that was covered in these seminars. Each item should take no longer than 30 minutes.
2. In the second five-hour session, students will answer a total of two questions, as described below.
 - a. Organizational research methodology. Students will answer one of two questions relating to research methods. It is expected that the student will spend approximately two hours on this question.
 - b. Integration within major. Students will answer one of four questions related to their major area. This 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). It is expected that the student will spend approximately three hours on this question.
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 may include author, date, and title information only. No annotations or coding beyond this information will be allowed.

B. Procedures Regarding the Examination.

1. A student wishing to sit for 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).
 - c. receive an affirmative response from the Department Chairperson regarding the taking of the exam and the date of the exam
2. Grading
 - a. Students must achieve an average score of 3.5 across the Session 1 questions. Each question is weighted the same in computing the Session 1 average. Failure to achieve the 3.5 average in Session 1 will require the student to retake Session 1 (with eight new questions over a four hour period) at a future comprehensive exam administration date. Students must also pass each of the Session 2 questions (i.e., 3.5 or better for each question related to research methods and the specialty area). Session 2 questions are evaluated separately. Should a student not achieve a 3.5 on the research methods question, they will have to retake that section of Session 2 (i.e., they will be given two new research methods questions, from which they must answer one question in a two hour time period) at a future comprehensive exam administration date. Should a student not achieve a 3.5 on the “integration within major” question, they will have to retake that section of Session 2 (i.e., they will be given four new integration within major questions, from which they must answer one question in a three hour time period) at a future comprehensive exam administration date. Students do not have to re-take parts of the exam that they have already passed, but a student is not considered to have passed the exam until they have successfully passed all parts of the 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—especially items in Session two—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 during the first administration of the test, a student fails some or all parts of the exam, he or she may retake the exam during either of the next two semesters, either Fall or Spring semester. A student has 12 months to retake and pass all three parts of the exam. A student fails to pass all sections of the exam after 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.

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 (see future target dates below). **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.

Electronic Submission's Approval Target Dates:

Summer 2012 – August 21

Fall 2012 – December 28

Spring 2013 – May 3

Summer 2013 – August 20

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 908 (Seminar in Organizational Theory)	
	Minor Area Course 1	
Year 1- Spring	MGT 914 (Advanced Organizational Research Methods)	
	MGT 910 (Seminar in Strategic Management)	
	Minor Area Course 2	EC 421 (Intro to Econometrics)
Year 1 – Summer	MGT 890 (3 credits)	
Year 2-Fall	MGT 909 (Seminar in Human Resource Management)	
	MSC 907 (Causal Models in Marketing)	MSC 907 --Causal Models in Marketing)
	Business concepts course 1	Minor Area Course 2
Year 2-Spring	MGT 907(Seminar in Organizational Behavior)	
	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. Active involvement in research.

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.

GEORGIA T. CHAO. Associate Professor. Professor Chao received her M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Industrial and Organizational Psychology from the Pennsylvania State University. Prior to joining MSU in 1985, she was Section Head of the Department of Management at the [General Motors](#) Institute. Her research interests are in the areas of organizational socialization, [teams and macrocognition](#), [young adults](#), and international human resource management. She was elected to the American Psychological Association (APA) Council and currently serves on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, the *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, and *Human Resource Management Review*. She is a member of the Academy of Management, APA, and the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In 1995 she received the Outstanding Publication in Organizational Behavior award presented by the Academy of Management's OB Division.

DONALD E. CONLON. Eli Broad Professor. Professor Conlon received his Ph.D. in business administration from the organizational behavior group at the University of Illinois. His research (which examines perceptions of justice in organizational

settings; conflict, negotiation and dispute resolution; and managerial decision making) has been published in a variety of journals, including the ***Academy of Management Journal***, ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, ***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 the editorial boards of the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, the *Journal of Management*, the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, and the *International Journal of Conflict Management*. Professor Conlon's teaching interests lie in the areas of organizational behavior and negotiation/dispute resolution.

JENNIFER R. DUNN. Assistant Professor. Professor Dunn received her doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania. In her research, she investigates how emotion and cognition influence trust, reputation, negotiations and ethical behavior. Her work has been published in the ***Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*** and ***Research on Managing Groups and Teams***. Excerpts of her research have also been published in the Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings.

RALPH HEIDL. Assistant Professor. Dr. Heidl received his Ph.D. at the University of Washington and his M.S. from the Pennsylvania State University. In his research, he examines how the collaborative history of partners affects the stability of and the knowledge flow within multi-partner alliances. He is a member of the Academy of Management and the Strategic Management Society. Excerpts of his research have been published in the Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings. He has several years of work experience in the design and implementation of collaborative business software for Fortune 500 companies. His most recent position was a Development Architect for SAP where he specialized in mobile business solutions for the pharmaceutical and beverage industries.

JOHN R. HOLLENBECK. Professor. Professor 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.

MARGARET V. HUGHES. Assistant Professor. Dr. Hughes received her Ph.D. degree at the University of Kentucky, her M.S. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and her B.A. from Duke University. Her research and teaching interests lie mainly in the areas of dynamic competitive interaction, investor psychology, and the structure of inter-organizational networks. She is a member of the Academy of Management and the Strategic Management Society. She has several years of work experience on Wall Street. Her most recent position was a Director for the United Bank of Switzerland where she specialized in analysis of biotechnology and pharmaceutical stocks.

RUSSELL E. JOHNSON. Assistant Professor. Professor Johnson is an assistant 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. His research examines the role of motivation- and leadership-based processes that underlie employee attitudes and behavior. His research has been published in *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Psychological Bulletin*, and *Research in Organizational Behavior*. He is an associate editor at *Journal of Business and Psychology* and currently serves on the editorial boards at *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, and *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*. Originally from Canada, Dr. Johnson still dreams of one day playing in the National Hockey League.

GERRY M. MCNAMARA. Professor. Dr. Gerry McNamara is a Professor of Management at Michigan State University. He received his Ph.D. from the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota. Previously, he was a member of the faculty at the University of California, Riverside and the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. His research focuses on strategic decision making, organizational risk taking, and mergers and acquisitions. His research has been published in numerous journals, including the *Academy of Management Journal*, the *Strategic Management Journal*, *Organization Science*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, the *Journal of Management*, and the *Journal of International Business Studies*. Dr. McNamara's research on mergers and

acquisitions has been abstracted in the *New York Times*, *Business Week*, the *Economist*, and *Financial Week*. He currently serves as an Associate Editor for the *Academy of Management Journal* and previously served on the editorial boards of the *Academy of Management Journal*, the *Academy of Management Review*, *Organization Science*, and the *Strategic Management Journal*. He is also a co-author of the textbook **Strategic Management: Creating Competitive Advantages** with Greg Dess, Tom Lumpkin, and Alan Eisner.

KENT D. MILLER. Professor. Professor Miller teaches strategic management and consulting. 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, routines, and philosophical issues pertaining to organizations and management research. He and his co-authors develop computer simulation models to explore social learning processes and their implications for organizations. Professor Miller 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*.

VERNON D. MILLER. Associate Professor. Vernon Miller received his Ph.D. in Speech Communication from The University of Texas at Austin. He is an Associate Professor in the Departments of Communication and Management at Michigan State University. He is a former Associate Dean for the College of Communication Arts and Sciences. His research focuses on the communicative aspects of the employment interview, organizational socialization, newcomer information seeking, and role negotiation as well as the role of communication in large-scale organizational change processes. His work appears in the *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *Management Communication Research*, *Communication Monographs*, *Academy of Management Review*, and *Journal of Managerial Issues*. Dr. Miller is a member of the Academy of Management, International Communication Association, and National Communication Association.

FREDERICK P. MORGESON. Professor of Management. He received his Ph.D. in Industrial and Organizational Psychology from Purdue University. Dr. Morgeson teaches and does research in Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior. His research has focused on four distinct areas. First, he has a continuing interest in leadership, particularly with respect to the role of leadership in self-managing teams and the nature of the relationship between leaders and followers. Second, Dr. Morgeson has examined fundamental questions about the nature of work, which includes how work is structured and how people perceive their work. These issues have been explored in a series of studies in the job analysis, work design, and work teams areas. Third, he has studied the effectiveness and consequences of different selection techniques. Fourth, Dr. Morgeson has explored issues of theory development and sought to produce

integrative research in the substantive research areas noted above. Dr. Morgeson has published his research in numerous top-tier Management and Psychology journals, co-authored the leading job analysis book (*Job Analysis: Methods, Research, and Applications for Human Resource Management*), authored or co-authored numerous book chapters, and presented his research at universities and conferences around the world. He is Editor of *Personnel Psychology* and the *Annual Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, is on the editorial board of the *Academy of Management Review*, and was elected to serve a five-year term as Executive Officer for the Academy of Management HR Division. He was formerly a member of the Academy of Management's HR Division Executive Committee, Associate Editor of *Personnel Psychology*, a member of the SHRM Foundation Board of Directors, and has served on the editorial boards of the *Annual Review of Psychology*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, and the *Journal of Management*. Finally, Dr. Morgeson is a recipient of the American Psychological Association Distinguished Scientific Award for Early Career Contribution to Psychology in Applied Psychology.

Prior to his academic career, Dr. Morgeson was a manager at a recording studio in the Detroit area. In addition, he has been involved in a variety of consulting and applied research projects for a number of organizations in the areas of job analysis, work design, recruiting, personnel selection, leadership development, compensation, and organizational assessment.

JOHN M. SCHAUBROECK. John A. Hannah Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Management. Professor Schaubroeck received his Ph.D. in Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management from Purdue University. He is currently the John A. Hannah Distinguished Professor of Psychology and Management at Michigan State University. He joined MSU in 2008. Dr. Schaubroeck has published over 70 refereed journal articles and several book chapters. His research interests relate to employee stress and well-being and leadership. Before joining MSU, Dr. Schaubroeck had served on the faculties of the University of Nebraska, City University of Hong Kong, and Drexel University. He served as Associate Editor and then Editor-in-Chief at *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes (OBHDP)* from 2004 through 2010.

BRENT SCOTT. Associate Professor. Brent Scott received his Ph.D. in Business Administration from the University of Florida and his B.A. in Psychology from Miami University. His research focuses on the role of mood and emotions at work, organizational justice, and coworker relationships. His research has been published in scholarly journals including *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, and *Journal of Management*.

JAMAL SHAMSIE. Associate Professor. Professor 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.

HOCK-PENG SIN. Assistant Professor. Hock-Peng Sin is an assistant professor of management at the Eli Broad College of Business at Michigan State University. His research interests include leadership, management of dynamic performance, as well as multi-level methodology in organizational research. His work appears in outlets such as *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Leadership Quarterly*, *Organizational Research Methods*, *Personnel Psychology*, and *Strategic Management Journal*. HP is also the recipient of two Best Student Paper awards and one Best Paper award at the Academy of Management meetings.

LINN VAN DYNE. Professor. Professor Van Dyne received her Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota with a concentration in Strategic Management and Organization. She also holds an MBA from the University of Minnesota and has fifteen years of work experience, including executive-level responsibility for worldwide human resources in a multinational manufacturing firm. Her research interests are proactive employee behaviors (including helping, voice, and silence), roles, cultural intelligence, and international organizational behavior. Dr. Van Dyne is Associate Editor for *Organizational Behavior* and *Human Decision Processes* and is on the editorial board of *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Human Relations*, *Management and Organizational Review*, and *Organizational Psychology Review*. Her publications include ***Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Organizational Behavior* and *Human Decision Processes*, *Research in Organizational Behavior***, and other outlets. She is a member of the Academy of Management, the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, the American Psychological Association, the Association for Psychological Science, and she is a Fellow in the Society of Organizational Behavior.

JOHN A WAGNER III. Professor and Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs. Professor 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 ***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 *Administrative Science Quarterly* and has served on the editorial board of the *Academy of Management Review*. He belongs to the Academy of Management and the Decision Sciences Institute. Professor Wagner 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, Chairperson and Eli Broad Legacy Fellow. Professor 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	
.....	http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/contracts/GEU2011-2015.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**

**Department of Management
Student Progress Evaluation Form**

Student's Name _____ Evaluation for the Year _____

Student's Signature and Date of Receipt _____

Acceptable	Unacceptable	Dimension and Comments
Marginal	Not Applicable	

_____	_____	_____	_____	COURSEWORK
				1. Performance in MGT core courses (Years 1-2)

_____	_____	_____	_____	2. Performance in MGT specialization (Years 2-3)
-------	-------	-------	-------	--

_____	_____	_____	_____	3. Progress toward coursework and examination completion (including minors and business competencies; Years 1-4)
-------	-------	-------	-------	--

_____	_____	_____	_____	TEACHING
				1. 300-level teaching performance (Years 1-5)

_____	_____	_____	_____	2. Ability to teach independently (Years 3-5)
-------	-------	-------	-------	---

_____	_____	_____	_____	RESEARCH
				1. Level of participation in ongoing research (Years 1-5)

_____	_____	_____	_____	2. Performance in MGT 890 (Years 1-4)
-------	-------	-------	-------	---------------------------------------

_____	_____	_____	_____	3. Ability to perform independent research (Years 3-5)
-------	-------	-------	-------	--

_____	_____	_____	_____	OTHER
				1. Proposal/dissertation progress (Years 3-5)

_____	_____	_____	_____	2. Attendance at MGT group meetings (brownbags, dissertation proposals and defenses, colloquia; Years 1-5)
-------	-------	-------	-------	--

_____	_____	_____	_____	3. Career goal assessment (Years 1-5)
-------	-------	-------	-------	---------------------------------------

_____	_____	_____	_____	4. Timely progress toward degree completion (Years 1-5)
-------	-------	-------	-------	---

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

APPENDIX C

Comprehensive Examination Performance Criteria

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

APPENDIX D

Code of Teaching Responsibility

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.
3. **Student Assessment and Final Grades:** Instructors shall be responsible for informing students, in a timely manner so as to enhance learning, of the grading criteria and methods used to determine grades on individual assignments. Instructors shall be responsible for assessing a student's performance based on announced criteria and on standards of academic achievement. Instructors shall submit final course grades in accordance with University deadlines.
4. **Testing Documents:** Instructors shall be responsible for returning to students student answers to quizzes, tests, and examinations with such promptness to enhance the learning experience. Instructors shall retain final examination answers for at least one semester to allow students to review or to retrieve them. All testing questions (whether on quizzes, tests, or mid-semester or final

examinations) are an integral part of course materials, and the decision whether to allow students to retain them is left to the discretion of the instructor.

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

Hearing Procedures

1. Students may register complaints regarding an instructor's failure to comply with the provisions of the *Code of Teaching Responsibility* directly with that instructor.
2. Students may also take complaints directly to teaching units' chief administrators or their designates. If those persons are unable to resolve matters to the student's satisfaction, they are obligated to transmit written complaints to unit committees charged with hearing such complaints. A copy of any complaint transmitted shall be sent to the instructor. A written report of the action or

recommendation of such groups will be forwarded to the student and to the instructor, normally within ten working days of the receipt of the complaint.

3. Complaints coming to the University Ombudsman will be reported, in writing, to chief administrators of the teaching units involved when in the Ombudsman's opinion a hearing appears necessary. It will be the responsibility of chief administrators or their designates to inform the instructor and to refer such unresolved complaints to the unit committees charged with hearing such complaints. A written report of the action or recommendation of such groups will be forwarded to the University Ombudsman, to the student, and to the instructor, normally within ten working days of the receipt of the complaint.
4. Students wishing to appeal a teaching unit action or recommendation may do so as outlined in Academic Freedom Report for Students at Michigan State University, Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities, or Medical Student Rights and Responsibilities .

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

APPENDIX E

Department of Management at Michigan State University

Effective Spring Semester 2012

Academic Hearing Procedures

The *Academic Freedom for Students at Michigan State University (AFR)* and the *Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR)* documents establish the rights and responsibilities of MSU students and prescribe procedures for resolving allegations of violations of those rights through formal grievance hearings. In accordance with the AFR and the GSRR, the Department of Management has established the following Department of Management Hearing Board procedures for adjudicating academic grievances and complaints. (See AFR Article 6 and 7; GSRR 5.4.1.)

I. JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT HEARING BOARD:

- A. The Department of Management Hearing Board serves as:
 - 1. the initial Hearing Board for academic grievance hearings involving graduate and undergraduate students who allege violations of academic rights and graduate students who seek seeking to contest an allegation of academic misconduct (academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards or falsifying admission and academic records). (See AFR 6.1.A and 7.I.B; GSRR 2.3.9 and 5.1.1.)
- B. Students may not request an academic grievance hearing based on an allegation of incompetent instruction. (AFR 2.II.A-D; GSRR 2.2.2 and 2.2.4.)

II. COMPOSITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT HEARING BOARD:

- A. The Department of Management shall constitute a standing Hearing Board Pool no later than the end of the tenth week of the spring semester. The Chairperson of the Department of Management will select Hearing Board members from among tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and adjunct faculty (professors of practice) in the Department. Five faculty members will serve in the Pool; each faculty member in the Pool will serve a 2-year term, which can be renewed. (AFR 6.1.B. and C; GSRR 5.1.2 and 5.1.6).

- B. For hearings involving graduate students, the Department of Management Hearing Board shall include two graduate students and three faculty, including the unit administrator or designee. For hearings involving undergraduate students, the Department Hearing Board shall include two undergraduate students and three faculty. Faculty for each Board are drawn from the pool of five Hearing Board Members. Faculty members in the pool who are not selected would stand by as alternates in the event that the parties to the hearing challenge one or more members of the Hearing Board. (AFR 6.1.B; GSRR 5.1.2.)
- C. The Chair of the Department of Management Hearing Board shall be a Hearing Board member with faculty rank. All members of the Department of Management Hearing Board shall have a vote, except the Chair, who shall vote only in the event of a tie. (See AFR 6.I.B; GSRR 5.1.5.)
- D. The Department of Management will inform hearing board members about these procedures and the applicable sections of the AFR and GSRR. (See AFR 7.IV.C; GSRR 5.1.3.)

III. REFERRAL TO DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT HEARING BOARD:

- A. After consulting with the instructor and appropriate unit administrator, undergraduate or graduate students who remain dissatisfied with their attempt to resolve an allegation of a violation of student academic rights may request an academic grievance hearing. When appropriate, the Department Chair/School Director, in consultation with the Dean, may waive jurisdiction and refer the request for a hearing to the College Hearing Board. At any time in the grievance process, students may consult with the University Ombudsman. (See AFR 7.III.A, 7.IV.H; GSRR 5.3.)
- B. 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 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 a hearing to the College Hearing Board. At any time in the grievance process, students may consult with the University Ombudsman. (See AFR 7.III.A, 7.IV.H; GSRR 5.3.)
- C. In cases of ambiguous jurisdiction, the Associate Provost for

Undergraduate Education will select the appropriate Hearing Board for hearings involving undergraduate students, and the Dean of The Graduate School will select the appropriate Hearing Board for cases involving graduate students. (See AFR 7.III.B; GSRR 5.3.)

- D. The deadline for submitting the written request for a hearing is the middle of the semester following the alleged violation. 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 Department of Management 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 still proceed. (See AFR 7.III.C; GSRR 5.3.6.1.)
- E. A written request for an academic grievance hearing must (1) specify the alleged violation(s) of academic rights as established by the AFR, GSRR or Code of Teaching Responsibility, (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 AFR 7.III.B and C, GSRR 5.3.6, and AFR footnote 35.)

IV. PRE-HEARING PROCEDURES

- A. After receiving a student's written request for a hearing, the Chair of the Management Department will promptly refer the grievance to the Chair of the Hearing Board. (See AFR 7.IV.D.1; 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 pool of 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 AFR 7.IV.D; GSRR 5.1.7.); and
 - 4. send the Hearing Board members a copy of the request for a hearing and send all parties a copy of these procedures.

- C. Within **5** class days of being established, the Department of Management Hearing Board shall review the request, and after considering all submitted information, the Hearing Board will:
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. invite the two parties to meet with the Department of Management Hearing Board in an informal session to try to resolve the matter. Such a meeting does not preclude a later hearing.
- (See AFR 7.IV.D.4 and AFR footnote 35; GSRR 5.4.6.)
- D. If the Department of Management Hearing Board calls for a hearing, the Chair of the Hearing Board shall promptly negotiate a hearing date and schedule an additional meeting only for the Hearing Board should additional deliberations on the findings become necessary.
- E. At least **5** class days before the scheduled hearing, the Chair of the Department of Management 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 Department of Management Hearing Board members after any challenges. (See AFR 7.IV.D.5; GSRR 5.4.7.)
- F. At least **3** class days before the scheduled hearing, the parties must notify the Chair of the Department of Management Hearing Board the names of their witnesses and advisor, if any, and request permission for the advisor to have voice at the hearing. The Chair may grant or deny this request. The Chair will promptly forward the names given by the complainant to the respondent and visa versa. (See AFR 7.IV.D.6 and footnote 35; 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 AFR 7.IV.D.10.)
- H. In unusual circumstances and in lieu of a personal appearance, either party may request permission to submit a written statement to the Department of Management Hearing Board or request permission to

participate in the hearing through an electronic communication channel.

Written statements must be submitted to the Department of Management Hearing Board at least 3 class days before the scheduled hearing. (See AFR 7.IV.D.9; GSRR 5.4.9c.)

- I. Either party to the grievance hearing may request a postponement of the hearing. The Department of Management Hearing Board may either grant or deny the request. (See AFR 7.IV.D.8; GSRR 5.4.8.)
- J. At its discretion, the Department of Management Hearing Board may set a reasonable time limit (e.g., 20 minutes) for each party to present its case, and the Chair of the Department of Management 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 Department of Management Hearing Board may close an open hearing to protect the confidentiality of information or to maintain order. (See AFR 7.IV.D.13; GSRR 5.4.10.4.)
- L. Members of the Department of Management Hearing Board are expected to respect the confidentiality of the hearing process. (AFR 7.IV.D.13, 7.IV.F; 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 Department of Management 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 student alleges a violation of academic rights, the student bears the burden of proof.

In faculty allegations of academic misconduct, the instructor bears the burden of proof. (Please Note: Undergraduate students must go before

the new University Academic Integrity Hearing Board to contest allegations of academic misconduct.)

- All Hearing Board decisions must be reached by a majority of the Hearing Board, based on a “preponderance of the evidence.”

(See AFR 7.IV.D.14, Footnote 37; GSRR 5.4.10.1. For various definitions, see AFR Article 11 and GSRR Article 8.)

2. If the complainant fails to appear in person or via an electronic channel at a scheduled hearing, the Department of Management Hearing Board may either postpone the hearing or dismiss the case for demonstrated cause. (See AFR 7.IV.D.11; GSRR 5.4.9a.)
3. If the respondent fails to appear in person or via an electronic channel at a scheduled hearing, the Department of Management Hearing Board may postpone the hearing, hear the case in the respondent’s absence, or dismiss the case. (See AFR 7.IV.D.11; 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 AFR 7.III.C; 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 AFR 7.IV.D.16; 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 Department of Management Hearing Board, the respondent and the respondent’s advisor, if any.
7. Presentation by the Complainant’s Witnesses: The Chair recognizes the complainant’s witness(es), if any, to present, without interruption, any statement directly relevant to the complainant’s case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the witness(es) by the Department of Management 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 directly relevant to the respondent's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the respondent by the Department of Management Hearing Board, the complainant, and the complainant's advisor, if any.

9. Respondent's witness(es), if any, to present, without interruption, and statement directly relevant to the respondent's case. The Chair then recognizes questions directed at the witness(es) by the Department of Management 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 Department of Management 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 Department of Management 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 III. I above.)

B. Decision:

1. In grievance (non-disciplinary) hearings involving undergraduate and graduate students and a majority of the Department of Management Hearing Board finds, based on a "preponderance of the evidence," that a violation of the student's academic rights has occurred and that redress is possible, it shall direct the Chair of the Department of Management to implement an appropriate remedy, in consultation with the Hearing Board. If the Department of Management Hearing Board

finds that no violation of academic rights has occurred, it shall so inform the Chair. (See AFR 7.IV.D and E; GSRR 5.4.11.)

2. In grievance (non-disciplinary) hearings involving graduate students in which the Department of Management Hearing Board serves as the initial hearing body to adjudicate an allegation of academic dishonesty and, based on a “preponderance of the evidence,” the Department of Management Hearing Board finds for the student, the Hearing Board shall recommend to the Chair of the Department of Management 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 complainant (instructor), the penalty grade shall stand and the Academic Dishonesty Report regarding the allegation will remain on file, pending an appeal, if any, within **5** class days, of the Department of Management Hearing Board’s decision to the College Hearing Board. If an academic disciplinary hearing is pending, and the Hearing Board decides for the complainant, 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 5.4.12.3 and 5.5.2.2.)

C. Written Report:

The Chair of the Department of Management Hearing Board shall prepare a written report of the Hearing Board’s findings, including redress for the complainant, if applicable, or sanctions, 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 report also should inform the parties of the right to appeal within **5** class days following notice of the decision. The Chair shall forward copies to the parties involved, the responsible administrators, the University Ombudsman and, in hearings involving graduate students, 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 AFR 7.IV.E and F; GSRR 5.4.11.)

VII. APPEAL OF DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT HEARING BOARD DECISION:

- A. In hearings involving undergraduate students, either party may appeal the

decision of the Department of Management Hearing Board to the University Academic Appeal Board in cases involving academic grievances alleging violations of student rights (See AFR 6.IV.A and 7.VII.).

- B. In hearings involving graduate students, either party may appeal a decision by the Department of Management Hearing Board to the College Hearing Board for cases involving (1) academic grievances alleging violations of student rights heard initially by the Department of Management Hearing Board 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.)
- C. All appeals must be in writing, signed and submitted to the Chair of either the University Academic Appeal Board or the College Hearing Board within **5** class days following notification of the Department of Management Hearing Board's decision. While under appeal, the original decision of the Department of Management Hearing Board will be held in abeyance. (See AFR 7.VII.A; GSRR 5.4.12, 5.4.12.2 and 5.4.12.3.)
- D. A request for an appeal of a Department of Management Hearing Board decision to either the University Academic Appeal Board or the College Hearing Board must allege, in sufficient particularity to justify a hearing, that the Department of Management Hearing Board failed to follow applicable procedures for adjudicating the hearing or that findings of the Department of Management Hearing Board were not supported by the "preponderance of the evidence." The request also must include the redress sought. Presentation of new evidence normally will be inappropriate. (See AFR 7.VII.A and B; 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 Department of Management 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 Department of Management Hearing Board to review the new material and render a decision on a new hearing. (See AFR 7.IV.G; GSRR 5.4.13.)

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.