

EEB, College and University Policies for Ph.D. and M.S. Students

The following information provides an abridged version of EEB Department, Rackham Graduate School, College of LSA, and university policies for Ph.D. and M.S. students. An updated list of applicable policies can also be found on the EEB department website and the [Rackham website](#). Please note that policies change from time to time, sometimes in the middle of the academic year. See the graduate coordinator for policy questions that incorporate the most up-to-date information.

EXISTING EEB POLICIES

EEB POLICY: *Definition of “In Good Standing”*

[See page 18 in the main text of the handbook.](#)

EEB POLICY: *Graduate Student Hosting*

Graduate Recruitment Weekend - To compensate graduate students who participate in the hosting of the graduate applicants invited to the EEB recruitment weekend, the department will provide the following reimbursement:

Reimbursement for one meal for the graduate host and applicant, not to exceed \$35 in total for the two individuals. Other people are welcome to join the applicant and host for the meal, however no reimbursement will be provided for additional guests. Original, itemized receipts must be provided to the graduate office to obtain reimbursement (this is University policy).

Reimbursement for mileage and parking will be provided for anyone driving a personal vehicle to the airport to pick up and deliver applicants. Mileage reimbursement will be provided at the university standard mileage between the central U-M campus and Detroit Metropolitan Airport (26 miles each way), and at the current University rate per mile (currently \$0.67 per mile). Original receipts must be provided for parking expenses.

In addition to the above, a single student host will receive \$20 per applicant to cover the cost of any other expenses not expressly defined above, including incidental food, mileage, and parking expenses other than to the airport. This stipend will be processed via the student financial system, and will not require separate receipts.

Any exception to the above reimbursements, or any additional request for reimbursement, must be approved in advance in order for it to be considered for separate reimbursement.

Initial Policy Approved – 2 February 2009

EEB POLICY: *Guidelines for Authorship*

This policy is adapted from the authorship policy of the Biomedical Graduate Group at the University of Pennsylvania.

1. Qualifications for authorship - All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship.
 - A. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for content.
 - B. Authorship credit should be based only on substantial contributions to the following areas:
 1. conception, design, analysis or interpretation of data
 2. drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content
 3. final approval of the version to be published
 - C. Conditions 1 and 3 must always be met in assignment of authorship; condition 2 may sometimes not be appropriate in cases of large collaborations.
 - D. Participation solely in the acquisition of funding or the collection of data does not justify authorship.
 - E. General supervision of the research group is not sufficient for authorship.
 - F. Appropriate credit for the contributions of other individuals to the work described in the publication should be made as an acknowledgement.
 - G. Any part of an article that is critical to its main conclusions must be the responsibility of at least one author. If that author is a student, then the faculty mentor shares the responsibility.
2. The order of authors:
 - A. The first author is that person who contributed most to the project, typically including writing the manuscript.
 - B. The sequence of author listing is generally determined by the relative contributions to the work. In the instance that equal credit is due, this should be footnoted by asterisk. It is suggested that authors be listed alphabetically in such a case; a policy you may wish to note on your CV.
 - C. Decisions about authors and the order in which they appear should be discussed at the beginning of the project and revisited periodically as the project develops. The order of names should be made by group consensus under the guidance of the lead investigator(s).
3. Corresponding author: The corresponding author is the person with whom communications should be made after publication; this is not necessarily the first author.
4. When conflicts arise: Even when the above guidelines are followed, conflicts of opinion may arise. When disagreements cannot be resolved within the research group or in discussion with the thesis committee, the student or faculty member may bring the issue in confidence to the EEB Executive Committee, which will serve as a grievance committee to mediate the conflict. If the chair or a member of the Executive Committee is involved in the conflict, they will be excused from participation in the grievance committee.

Established 15 September 2008

EEB POLICY: *Substitution policy regarding Departmental and External Fellowships and GSRA's*

Students cannot receive both a departmental fellowship and an external fellowship or traineeship at the same time. A student cannot receive fellowship/traineeship support and departmental summer support at the same time. External fellowship funding will be supplemented by the department to achieve the guaranteed stipend of the current academic year, if necessary. External fellowships and traineeships are not supplementary, but substitute first, for departmentally-funded fellowships and second, for the GSRA.

Substitutions of support depend upon the term of the fellowship as follows:

- 1) 3-Year Fellowship: A 3 year fellowship would substitute for the year of departmental fellowship and, unless waived by the advisor, the year of GSRA support. This student would then teach a maximum of 4 terms, perhaps less if the advisor chooses to still support a student as a GSRA.
- 2) 2-Year Fellowship: A 2 year fellowship would substitute for the year of departmental fellowship and, unless waived by the advisor, the year of GSRA support.
- 3) 1-Year Fellowship: A 1 year fellowship would substitute for the departmental fellowship and the student would be expected to be supported by a GSRA for one year by their advisor.

EEB POLICY: *Additional Funding Policies:*

1. Students must pass Step 1 of the prelims process in the winter of their first year to receive a departmental fellowship in the next fall semester (or beyond).
2. While on a fellowship, a student cannot also accept a 25% appointment (0.25 FTE or higher) as a GSI or GSRA. Students can petition the GAC for exceptions if the appointment will significantly benefit their graduate training or research.
3. Students can use a fellowship beyond the ten terms of support as a GSI allowed by LSA.
4. GSM (Graduate Student Mentorship) (0.17 appointments) funding is added to the guaranteed yearly stipend (i.e. guaranteed stipend will not be reduced by the GSM amount received).
5. Summer teaching: Students who GSI during the spring or summer terms can petition the GAC for summer support but will not automatically receive it.
6. Summer support: If a student receives a fellowship to begin the spring/summer term, it will not "replace" summer support permanently, but will defer it (regardless of the actual amount received while on fellowship to date) should summer support be needed when the fellowship ends. Spring or summer tuition will be paid if the student defends during one of these terms within the five years.
7. For students who have been granted departmental award money for research expenses, either from endowments or other departmental funds, no funds shall be disbursed or information to access the funds (e.g., a shortcode to charge items against when purchasing) until all prior departmental debt has been paid. If the student wishes to access funds prior to debt payment, they may petition the GAC.

EEB POLICY: *Tuition Funding for Summer Dissertation Defense*

For students who defend their Ph.D. dissertation during the spring/summer term in their fifth

year or earlier, the department will fund half of the tuition cost, with the expectation that the advisor, student, or other funding source will fund the other half. Students will receive the guaranteed summer stipend as usual. This option is only available once. If a student chooses not to defend during the summer term that the tuition is paid, subsequent tuition fees associated with the defense will be the responsibility of the student.

To request summer tuition funding, the student must petition the Graduate Affairs Committee and demonstrate that they have an established defense date. Students should wait to pay tuition until they are certain they will defend that term. Their advisor must also provide a letter (an email is fine) confirming that the student will be able to defend during the term when tuition will be paid.

Established 3 March 2008

EEB POLICY: *Teaching*

Ph.D. students are required by the department to teach a minimum of two terms, one of which must be prior to advancement to candidacy. All graduate-level students are allowed by the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LSA) to teach a maximum of ten (10) terms. Students can petition LSA for an additional term but it is not likely this will be granted except in unusual circumstances. The full [Ten Term Rule can be found on LSA's website](#).

EEB POLICY: *Evaluation Examination Retakes*

For retaken portions of the preliminary examination, the procedures will be as follows. A second failure of any portion of the examination will result in the recommendation that the student be separated from the program.

For any one portion of the preliminary examination (i.e., the oral exam, seminar or grant proposal), if a student receives two “unacceptable” ratings, or one “unacceptable” and one “marginal,” they will be deemed to have failed that portion, and it will be recommended to the Faculty that the student be required to retake this portion of the examination, typically in the following term.

Continuity in the student's Preliminary Exam Committee is important. When one or all portions of the preliminary examination must be retaken, the Preliminary Exam Committee will have the same composition as it had for the first evaluation, to the extent possible. In particular, for students who must retake all portions of the preliminary examination in the Fall term, the Preliminary Exam Committee should include at least one standing member from the earlier Preliminary Exam Committee, if possible.

For portions of the preliminary examination retaken, the procedures will be as above except that a second failure of any portion of the examination will result in the recommendation that the student be separated from the program and that a “pass”/“not pass” rating will be used by the committee members. When a student, retaking part of the preliminary examination,

receives a unanimous pass from the Preliminary Exam Committee, the Graduate Affairs Committee will make the final decision and report later to the EEB Faculty. If the decision by the Evaluation Committee is not unanimous or if there are outstanding concerns, the recommendation will be presented to the EEB Faculty for discussion and the Faculty's recommendation will be communicated to the Graduate Affairs Committee for final disposition as above.

In the event that the Graduate Affairs Committee recommends separation from the program, a student will become ineligible for departmental fellowships for the remainder of his or her time in the program.

Approved by the Executive Committee: March 5, 2012

Approved by Faculty: March 19, 2012

Amended March 17, 2013 to include specifics that feedback by precandidate seminar committee will take place in a group meeting with all members of the committee after the presentation.

Amended by GAC: September 30, 2015 (changed to pass/not pass ratings for retake exams to be consistent with the rest of policy)

EEB POLICY: *Embedded M.S. Degree*

Students wishing to obtain an “embedded M.S. degree” during their Ph.D. course of study should notify the graduate coordinator of their intent. After contacting the graduate coordinator, students must “apply for graduation” through the Student Business section of Wolverine Access. Notation of the M.S. degree will then be added to the student’s transcript by the Registrar’s Office, usually by the end of the following term. Please note that 24 graded credits (including the grade of S – Satisfactory) are required to receive an embedded M.S. degree (more than the 18 required to advance to candidacy. In addition, courses elected as visit (audit) do not meet this requirement, nor do any doctoral courses (those designated as 995, etc.)).

EEB POLICY: *Time to Completion of Degree*

Ph.D. students who have not completed their dissertation after six years in the program will be required to petition the GAC to retain their committee. The petition must make a compelling case that they will complete their dissertation within a reasonable time and they must state a specific time schedule. The petition must be accompanied by a letter of support by their major advisor.

If the petition is not made or is not accepted by the GAC, the dissertation committee will be dissolved. Students will be withdrawn from the EEB graduate program and the Rackham Graduate School. After withdrawal, students will not have access to any University resources. All policies regarding Rackham’s Continuous Enrollment Policy must also be satisfied. For more information, see the [Rackham website](#).

Established June 2005

EEB POLICY: *Winter Term Admission for Ph.D. Students*

EEB will admit students in winter term under unusual circumstances. Given that these students are likely to have very different circumstances and different backgrounds, we do not feel it advisable to set a rigid policy for their evaluation. Incoming students in the Ph.D. and M.S. programs will meet with their initial advisor and the admissions committee to discuss courses and deficiencies. Ph.D. students will have an additional meeting early in the winter term to determine their schedule for their evaluation prelims. This meeting will be with the student, the major advisor, and the chairs of the admissions committee and the Graduate Affairs Committee. This committee will decide on the evaluation schedule based upon this discussion and the background and experience of the student.

EEB POLICY: *Dual Degrees*

Ph.D. and Master's students who want to apply for a dual degree with a M.S. degree based on coursework in the EEB department, need to submit the following to the EEB admissions committee: a completed dual degree course election form and a new, one page statement of purpose explaining why they want a dual degree in our EEB department. The applicant must arrange to have other materials (CV or resume, transcripts, and letters of recommendation) forwarded from their main department to the EEB graduate office. Students will be required to have an advisor in EEB to guide them in course selection. Students can contact an advisor directly or choose one in consultation with the admissions committee.

EEB POLICY: *Student Vacations*

Students are entitled to University-designated holidays plus up to 2 weeks of additional time off, with the total of vacation time plus University-designated holidays not to exceed 4 weeks per year. The timing of vacation days must be discussed with the advisor prior to making any travel arrangements. Any further vacation time must have the approval of the mentor, which may be granted without financial support.

Approved by GAC - February 2018

EXISTING RACKHAM, LSA AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES

The graduate programs of the Rackham Graduate School are located in the schools, colleges, and departments of the University of Michigan. The academic policies and regulations in this document have been established by the Rackham Executive Board to ensure consistent standards in admissions, registration, degree requirements, and the awarding of degrees across all Rackham graduate programs. Individual graduate programs have additional requirements and rules. Students are expected to be familiar with both the policies of the graduate school and those of their programs.

The graduate school maintains an academic, scholarly, and professional code of conduct to safeguard standards of learning, research, and professional integrity. Students are expected to understand and observe these standards. In conjunction with the schools and colleges, the

graduate school has procedures for investigating allegations of misconduct and imposing sanctions.

The authoritative version of Rackham Graduate School Academic Policies is updated annually and published online. In the event of any discrepancy, the version published on the Rackham website is the authoritative version. Each new edition is archived.

This edition of Rackham Graduate School Academic Policies was written by Assistant Dean Emily Swafford, with help from staff members of the Rackham Graduate School. Comments or suggestions are welcome. Students, faculty, and staff may send comments to rackham.policies@umich.edu.

RACKHAM POLICY: *Rackham Academic Probation and Dismissal*

3.5 Deficiencies in Academic Progress, Academic Probation, and Dismissal

Satisfactory academic standing, sometimes referred to as good academic standing, is defined by the graduate school and the academic program of the student. The graduate school considers students to be in satisfactory standing except as defined in section 3.5.1. Academic programs may, at their discretion, publish additional criteria for satisfactory academic standing.

Students should meet with their advisors regularly to discuss their academic performance and progress toward the degree. Graduate programs should immediately notify students in writing when performance falls below an acceptable level. The graduate school may take any of the following actions when a student's academic performance or progress toward the degree is deficient:

- enter a notation of unsatisfactory academic standing on the academic record;
- place a student on probation upon recommendation of the program;
- require a student to withdraw from the university; or
- not confer a degree or certificate.

3.5.1 Unsatisfactory Academic Standing

The graduate school will place a notation of "below minimum academic requirements" on the academic record at the end of the term in which a student's cumulative GPA falls below a B (3.0 on a 4.0 point scale). Graduate programs may have additional minimum academic requirements, such as requiring minimum grades in the overall program or in particular courses. The program will publish these additional minimum academic requirements and notify Rackham OARD when it determines that a student's performance is unsatisfactory. The program may decide whether unsatisfactory academic standing may be a basis for placing a student on academic probation.

A student with unsatisfactory academic standing will not be advanced to candidacy, will not be awarded a degree or graduate certificate, and may change programs and transfer credits only with permission of the admitting program. Upon the recommendation of the graduate chair, and with the consent of the graduate school, a student will be given an opportunity to correct the

academic deficiency and return to satisfactory academic standing.

A master's student with unsatisfactory academic standing cannot be approved for detached study (section 2.3.1). A master's student with unsatisfactory academic standing when last enrolled in the graduate school who wishes to be reinstated or change fields or degree level must petition the program and the graduate school to modify the conditions of academic standing. The petition should: provide reasons for the poor academic record; explain how conditions that produced this performance have changed; and present specific plans for improvement. The graduate program must approve the petition before a student can be reinstated (section 2.3.3). A master's student whose cumulative GPA falls below a B (3.0 on a 4.0 point scale), is not making satisfactory progress toward the degree, and is failing to succeed in his or her plan of studies, may be denied permission to register, required to withdraw, or dismissed from the program. Time limits for a master's degree are discussed in section 5.

Students may also be dismissed for failing to meet the standards of academic and professional integrity (Appendix 1, Academic and Professional Integrity and Procedures for Investigating Allegations of Academic and Professional Misconduct).

3.5.2 Academic Probation and Dismissal: Ph.D. and D.M.A. Programs

Ph.D. and D.M.A. programs have program-level policy for academic probation and dismissal that is consistent with the following Graduate School guidelines.

In accordance with its published policy, a program may place on academic probation a student who has academic or professional difficulties, as defined by the program, that prevent progress toward the degree. Academic probation is normally required before a program may recommend to the graduate school that a doctoral student be dismissed for academic reasons. As an exception, and only with advance notice to students, program policy may allow dismissal without probation for a student who fails to pass candidacy or preliminary exams. Academic probation will be noted on the student unofficial transcript.

3.5.2.1 Placing a Student On Academic Probation

The advisor or graduate chair or director may recommend that a student be placed on academic probation. The decision to place a student on probation must be made by a faculty group of at least three persons to include, for example, the department chair (or the chair's designee), the graduate chair, and the advisor; the graduate committee of the program; or another committee constituted of faculty. A D.M.A. student who has been placed on academic probation will not be eligible for detached study (section 2.3.1).

3.5.2.2 Length of the Probationary Period

The probationary period may be no shorter than two months of the fall or winter term and ordinarily conclude at the end of that term. For a student placed on academic probation within two months of the end of the fall term, the probationary period will extend into the winter term for a total of at least two months. For a student placed on academic probation within two months of

the end of the winter term, the probationary period may include the spring or summer half-terms or the following fall term, for a total of at least two months. A student may be placed on academic probation starting in the spring or summer half term for a minimum of two months, and does not need to be enrolled during these half terms.

3.5.2.3 Notifications

The graduate chair must notify the student and Rackham OARD in writing before the probationary period begins, explaining the reasons and conditions of probation; the start and end dates of the probationary period; funding support (see below); conditions, if any, for removal from probation; and options for appeal (see below). A student who has been placed on probation may request a leave of absence from Rackham or withdraw (sections 2.2.2, 2.2.3). The leave or withdrawal will stop the clock on the probationary period, which resumes when the student returns to active status or is reinstated. Probation will remain in effect until the conditions are remedied or the student is dismissed.

3.5.2.4 Funding a Student on Probation

The level of funding prior to academic probation should be continued through the probationary period.

3.5.2.5 End of the Probationary Period and Dismissal

At the end of academic probation, and upon the recommendation of the graduate chair and the consent of the graduate school, a student may either be removed from probation or dismissed from the program. The decision to dismiss a student must be made by a faculty group of at least three persons to include, for example, the department chair (or the chair's designee), the graduate chair, and the advisor; the graduate committee of the program; or another committee constituted of faculty. The graduate chair must notify Rackham OARD of a recommendation for dismissal.

3.5.2.6 Option to Appeal Academic Probation or Dismissal

Students must be notified of options to appeal academic probation or dismissal. The program should constitute a separate committee of review to consider appeals. Students may use the graduate school's Academic Dispute Resolution process only for procedural issues of fair and equal treatment under the policy of the program, and not to appeal the academic reasons for the decision. Students who fail to meet standards of academic or professional integrity or who have been found responsible for violations of other university standards of conduct may be dismissed in accordance with separate procedures described in Rackham Academic and Professional Integrity Policy (section 8).

RACKHAM POLICY: *Rackham Academic and Professional Integrity Policy*

8 Rackham Academic and Professional Integrity Policy

Integrity in research and scholarship is a fundamental value of the University of Michigan. It is the responsibility of all students to conduct research and scholarly activities in an ethical manner at all times. An indispensable part of graduate education is for students to become

knowledgeable about the responsible conduct of research and scholarship appropriate to their discipline or field of study. Students are responsible for understanding and observing the graduate school's academic and professional integrity policy. Students are also expected to understand and maintain standards of integrity and professional conduct endorsed by their program that are particular to their field of study and research.

This policy defines serious violations of academic integrity. Allegations of violations will lead to inquiries conducted under the authority of the graduate school or other schools and colleges, and may result in the imposition of disciplinary actions. Procedures for these inquiries are described below (see section 9.3).

Other units in the university maintain campus-wide policies and procedures concerning personal conduct including [sexual harassment](#) and [misconduct](#); [assault, theft, cyber-misconduct, and other violations](#); [discrimination and harassment in the workplace](#); [conflict of interest](#); [use of information technology resources](#); [misconduct in sponsored research](#); protocols for the conduct of [research involving human subjects](#) and [animal use](#); and [requirements concerning export controls and access restrictions for certain technologies](#). Students engaged in research are expected to understand and follow the policies and regulations that apply to their investigations.

RACKHAM POLICY: *Continuous Enrollment*

[2.2 Registration and Enrollment for Ph.D. Programs](#)

Students in Ph.D. programs must register for each fall and winter term until final completion of degree requirements unless they have received an authorized leave of absence (section 2.2.2) or have been approved for extramural study (section 2.2.1). Because students are expected to make year-round academic progress toward the Ph.D. degree, students enrolled in the fall and winter terms are entitled to services during the spring and summer half terms whether or not they are registered. A student who takes candidacy or preliminary exams in a spring or summer half term must register in that half term. A student who defends the dissertation and/or finalizes degree requirements in a spring or summer half term must register for the full spring/summer term and submit the final dissertation and all materials by the published deadline to avoid registering for another term (section 4.4.10).

RACKHAM POLICY: *Reinstatement in the Ph.D. Program*

[2.2.4 Reinstatement to a Ph.D. Program](#)

A student who has withdrawn or been discontinued from a Ph.D. program while in good academic standing (section 2.2.3), or has been discontinued for failing to show sufficient progress (section 3.5), may seek reinstatement to the same program or apply to a different program. A student who has withdrawn or been discontinued from a Ph.D. program may apply for reinstatement only once per academic term. Procedures and more information on reinstatement can be found [here](#).

RACKHAM POLICY: *Precandidate Coursework*

4 Doctoral Degrees

During precandidacy students take preliminary coursework and prepare for advanced research by completing at least [18 hours of graded graduate coursework](#) on the Ann Arbor campus. Precandidates who are successful in this coursework, who meet other program requirements including passing preliminary or qualifying exams, and who demonstrate readiness to do original and independent research, are admitted to candidacy by their program.

While credits earned at another institution cannot be transferred to a doctoral program, students may seek approval from their program to use credits earned elsewhere to satisfy certain degree requirements. These credits do not appear on the transcript.

RACKHAM POLICY: *Candidacy Course Registration*

4.4.2 Candidacy Course Registration

Ph.D. candidates register in the fall and winter terms for eight credit hours of 995/Dissertation Candidate. Parttime enrollment is not permitted. A student who defends in either the spring or summer half term must register for 8 credit hours of 995 for the spring/summer full term, or for both 4 credits in the spring half-term and 4 credits in the summer half-term.

A candidate who registers for a course must seek prior approval from the faculty advisor and also register for 995. A candidate may elect either one course per term, or more than one course for a total of no more than four credits, without paying additional tuition. Courses may be taken for credit or as a visit (audit). A candidate who does not elect a course during a term of 995 enrollment may, in the next term, either register for courses for no more than 8 credits or register for no more than two courses that total more than 8 credits without paying additional tuition. An additional course may not be taken in anticipation of taking none in a future term of 995 enrollment. A candidate who takes courses beyond this limit will be assessed tuition.

When a candidate registers for a course during the fall, winter, or spring and summer half-terms but does not register for 995, the Registrar's Office will add the 995 to the term and assess any required tuition.

RACKHAM POLICY: *Time Limit for Completing a Doctoral Degree*

4.4.1 Time Limit for Completing a Doctoral Degree

Students are expected to complete the degree within five years of achieving candidacy but no more than seven years from the date of the first enrollment in their program. Rackham will notify programs when students do not complete their degree within this period. Programs should conduct annual reviews of candidates to assess progress toward the degree. Students who have not completed the degree within the seven year limit should petition Rackham OARD for an extension of time to degree with a plan for completion. The program may require a student who does not complete the degree after two years of extension to return to precandidacy status and to meet candidacy requirements again.

RACKHAM POLICY: *Leave of Absence*

2.2.2 Leaves of Absence for Ph.D. Students

The Department of EEB follows [Rackham's policy](#) regarding leave of absence and continuous enrollment guidelines. In addition, please note that prior to applying for a leave of absence of any sort allowed under the continuous enrollment policy, students must consult with the department graduate chair to discuss the student's plans and define a proposal/timeline for the continuation of study. Rackham requires that department graduate chairs approve all leaves of absence, so this conversation is not optional. Please notify the graduate chair (currently Marjorie Weber, webermg@umich.edu) as soon as possible if you are considering taking a leave of absence.

RACKHAM POLICY: *Transfer of Credit*

5.7 Transfer of Credit

Graduate credits from outside the graduate school or the university may be transferred to a master's program (but not a doctoral program) for up to half the credits required for the degree. Requests for transfer of graduate credit must be approved by the program and by Rackham OARD. See Rackham's website for guidelines on transfer credit eligibility and criteria or contact the graduate program assistant.

EEB/RACKHAM POLICY: *Dual Appointments*

It is understood that this policy cannot be too rigid due to the variety of external funding that students are awarded. Teaching is valuable and we hope that this policy will allow us to reach a final decision through negotiations with students.

Fellowships are awarded to students so that they can be relieved of all other duties outside of their dissertation research. Students who are appointed on any fellowship including external fellowships such as NSF and want to accept a GSI, GSRA, or GSSA appointment will need to petition the GAC. Students are required to wait for a final decision from the GAC before accepting the GSI, GSRA, or GSSA appointment.

Students who are appointed on any fellowship and want to accept an appointment less than 0.25 FTE can do so without petitioning the GAC.

EEB does have a two term teaching requirement but it is not time-specific (except for the requirement for advancement to candidacy for Ph.D. students) and deferring a fellowship in order to accept a GSI or GSRA does not require petition but it is up to the students, in consultation with their advisor.

RACKHAM POLICY: *Graduate Student Parental Accommodation*

2.5 Graduate Student Parental Accommodation

Graduate student parental accommodation allows a student to maintain registered full-time student status immediately following the birth or adoption of a young child, along with all the benefits of such status, while facilitating the return to full academic participation. Eligible students may be granted a parental accommodation of up to eight weeks while continuing to be

enrolled full-time, and extension of certain time limits. Rules of research funding or external fellowships may require suspension of payments during the parental accommodation period. In this instance, the Rackham Parental Accommodation Fund may provide salary or stipend, and benefits.

A student must submit a Request for Graduate Student Parental Accommodation after consultation with her or his advisor, principal investigator, and graduate chair. The form must be submitted to the student's graduate program office for approval and forwarded to Rackham for authorization. The student provides Rackham with appropriate documentation of the anticipated birth or adoption (a letter from the student's medical provider with an estimate of delivery date or from the adoption agency with an estimate of placement date). Further information is found on the [Graduate Student Parental Accommodation Policy section of Rackham's website](#).

For other family care issues affecting time to degree, see section 2.6.

ADDITIONAL RACKHAM POLICIES

See the following link for more information on specific Rackham topics and policies:

[Withdrawal and Discontinuation from a Ph.D. Program](#)

[Retroactive Term Withdrawal](#)

[Oral Defense Preparation](#)

[Post-Defense Meeting and Dissertation Revisions](#)

[Submitting Dissertation to University Library](#)

[Dissertation Embargo](#)

[Dispute Resolution](#)

[Discrimination and Harassment](#)

[Accommodations for Students with Disabilities](#)

[Rackham Forms and Applications](#)

Appendix A: University Lands Available for Field Research

The University of Michigan Biological Station

Features: Consists of approximately 10,000 acres of land including a variety of habitats. Access to state and federal lands is also excellent. An eight week summer session of classes is run as well as a limited-schedule, four week spring term. Facilities are excellent, with a fully equipped lab for both terrestrial and aquatic studies, a newly constructed greenhouse, and year-round housing.

Location: Near the tip of the Lower Peninsula, 6 miles east of Pellston, MI. For more information, see the Biological Station Office in the Chemistry Building, or contact the UMBS Director, Dr. Knute Nadelhoffer, or Associate Director, Karie Slavik. An information booklet is prepared annually. Funding is available for study and research through a variety of sources.

Matthaei Botanical Gardens (including Radrick Forest and Bog):

Features: An extensive greenhouse facility, with exhibits open to the public 10:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m. every day. Two hundred forty acres of land are also open 8:00 a.m. to sunset. Marked trails lead through forest, marsh, and swamp. Also present are a variety of more isolated areas which may be useful for research, including upland and lowland woods, fields, and meadows. Fleming Creek flows through the property. Radrick Forest and Bog are administered by the gardens and are located just to the south of the main gardens area. A complete staff of administrators, horticulturists, gardeners and a caretaker is present.

Location: Just east of Ann Arbor. For details on using the gardens for research contact Dr. Robert Grese at 998-9540. Funds are available for graduate student research. Contact the graduate office for information about these funds. Maps are also available.

E.S. George Reserve:

Features: The reserve comprises about two square miles of protected land, including upland forests, fields, swamps, marshes, four permanent ponds, as well as many temporary ponds. Housing is available for both married and unmarried investigators, and a small library, shop and an animal room are present. Unsurfaced roads provide access to most parts of the area.

Location: Near Pinckney, Michigan. For more information, contact Dr. Earl Werner, Associate Director of the ESGR, for details about doing research on the reserve. A map is available. Some funds are available for research on the reserve.

Mud Lake Bog:

Features: The trail leads first across a field, then descends into an extensive swamp forest. During wet periods the swamp may be flooded. By following blue marks painted on trees, you will arrive at the bog proper, which surrounds Mud Lake. The bog has large floating mats and much poison sumac. Marshes can be found on the west side of the bog.

Location: Near Whitmore Lake, in Washtenaw County. For more information: This property is administered by the Botanical Gardens. Contact Dr. Robert Grese at 998-9540 for research use possibilities.

Newcomb Tract:

Features: The tract includes 206 acres. The Huron River and Base Lake border the tract on the northwest and north, respectively. Used primarily for class field trips and exercises, the area offers a diverse sampling of habitats suitable for research. About 30 acres of marsh border Base Lake. Another small lake is nearby. Also present are riverbottom forest, upland oak-hickory forest, and fields in various stages of succession.

Location: This property is located 14 miles northwest of Ann Arbor at the intersection of Huron River Drive and Strawberry Lake Road.

Nichols Arboretum:

Features: The area includes woods, lawns, and banks of the Huron River. Though probably not useful for most kinds of field research, the “Arb” is popular among ornithologists and those seeking to refresh their knowledge of plants. The property is open from dawn to dusk each day.

Location: The Arboretum is located on Geddes Avenue, about one third of a mile east of the Biological Sciences Building. Signs are posted at the entrance.

For more information, contact Dr. Robert Grese at 998-9540.

The Chase S. Osborn Preserve on Sugar Island:

Features: Consists of over 300 acres at the southern tip of Sugar Island. Contains mainly second growth hardwood forest including extensive swamps. The shoreline is dominated by white pine. A large lodge with a fully equipped kitchen is available to researchers.

Location: This preserve is located on Sugar Island in Chippewa County in northwest corner of the Upper Peninsula bordering Canada.

For more information: For more information, see the Biological Station Office in the Chemistry Building, or contact the UMBS Director, Dr. Aimee Classen or Associate Director Karie Slavik. Funding is available for research.

Appendix B: Sample mentoring plans

Graduate Student Mentoring Guide: “Rackham Graduate School’s mentoring guide for graduate students, [Graduate Student Mentoring Guide](#), has proven to be a popular item for two decades; it has been requested, adopted, and adapted by graduate students, faculty, and staff around the country. The first handbook was created by Jane London and Glenda Haskell in 1999, and since that time, many Rackham contributors have updated the guide based on new scholarship and resources related to mentoring. Improving the quality of advising and mentoring available to our graduate students, as well as providing resources for both graduate students and faculty, remains a top priority for Rackham.

People often use the terms advisor and mentor interchangeably, but they are not the same. The guide will clearly define the multiple roles that faculty will have in your professional and academic development. It encourages you to develop a mentoring relationship with your advisor, set clear expectations with your advisor, and cultivate a team of mentors to get the support you need during graduate school. A team of mentors is essential to your success in graduate education, and you will want to identify multiple mentors to support your development.”

In addition, Rackham publishes a companion handbook for faculty, [How to Mentor Graduate Students: A Guide for Faculty](#).

MORE Committee: [Rackham’s Faculty Committee on Mentoring \(MORE\)](#), “engages with faculty and graduate students to foster conversations about mentoring. Specifically, the committee provides faculty with effective tools and practices for mentoring graduate students in an effort to improve retention, productivity and overall student success.”

The MORE Committee offers multiple workshops every year for student/mentor pairs to introduce them to written mentoring plans. Workshop dates/times and registration will be announced to the department and can also be found on their [website](#). Additional mentoring resources are also accessible from their website.

Sample Mentoring Plans: The following may be used as examples of formal mentoring plans, or as examples of talking points between students and their mentors.

[Sample mentoring plan 1](#)

[Sample mentoring plan 2](#)

[MORE Committee STEM and Social Sciences Focus Template](#)

[MORE Committee Co-Mentoring Template](#)

Appendix C: EEB 730 Paper Rubric

The purpose of the 730 paper is to open dialogue between the student, advisor, and secondary advisor about the student's scientific interests, and to serve the student by supporting their conceptual growth and writing skills. This requirement was formalized to encourage the development of the student's dissertation topic, provide a stepping stone to Step 2 of the prelims, and to allow the student to explore multiple perspectives of a topic while identifying knowledge gaps. Another beneficial outcome may be the foundation for the introduction to either the proposal required in year 2 or potentially future research papers.

The student and advisor/secondary advisor can collaboratively decide on the structure of the 730 paper (e.g., literature review, original data paper, meta analysis, etc) that they think best supports the student's academic development. However, the topic should address an issue of broad ecological or evolutionary interest and must be original. In light of this flexibility in structure, the rubric is itself broad.

Overall, the work should highlight key concepts in ecology and/or evolution and display understanding of both broad and specific knowledge in the student's field and subfield. The production of the 730 paper should be thought of as a process wherein the advisors and student discuss a topic, develop ideas, and then the student iteratively transforms an initial idea following feedback. Critical to this process will be consecutive meetings during which outlines, drafts, and figures are shared and discussed. References used in the development of the 730 paper should be identified by the primary and/or secondary faculty advisor and student together, but with the majority of references identified by the student.

Satisfactory papers should include:

- A clear thesis and central idea; the development of the central idea must incorporate broad ecological/evolutionary concepts with more specific knowledge,
- Acknowledgement of the complexity of the idea with some indication of gaps in knowledge in the field and the importance of pursuing the topic,
- An interpretation of evidence, explaining connections between concepts, and logical progression of ideas,
- Clear format,
- Sufficient use of the literature to support an argument or the development of a concept, acknowledgement of the limitations of discussed approaches, and ideally demonstration of rigorous approach to testing and/or examining said topic.

Advisors will rate the 730 paper on the following: 1) integration of knowledge, 2) topic focus, 3) depth of discussion, 4) cohesiveness, 5) spelling and grammar, and 6) sources and citations. Points 1-3 relate to the student's ability to highlight key concepts in ecology and/or evolution and display understanding of both broad and specific knowledge in the student's field and subfield. Points 4-6 capture aspects of the student's stylistic presentation, clarity, and thoroughness.

Evaluation and use of the rubric--It is important to note that these ratings are designed to lead the student towards the production of a finished product, and that the GAC anticipates the advisor and secondary advisor will determine the student's grade not only on quality of the finished product but also given evidence for improvement following feedback during this iterative

process. The advisor and secondary advisor, after receiving feedback from the EEB 701 instructor, discuss the evaluations and decide upon a grade (S/U).

INTEGRATION OF KNOWLEDGE

- 1: The paper demonstrates that the author fully understands and has applied concepts learned during the 730. Concepts are integrated into the writer's own insights. The writer provides concluding remarks that show analysis and synthesis of ideas.
- 2: The paper demonstrates that the author, for the most part, understands and has applied concepts learned during the 730. Some of the conclusions, however, are not supported in the body of the paper
- 3: The paper demonstrates that the author, to a certain extent, understands and has applied concepts learned during the 730.
- 4: The paper does not demonstrate that the author has fully understood and applied concepts learned during the 730.

TOPIC FOCUS

- 1: The topic is focused narrowly enough for the scope of this assignment. A thesis statement provides direction for the paper, either by statement of a position or hypothesis.
- 2: The topic is focused but lacks direction. The paper is about a specific topic but the writer has not established a position.
- 3: The topic is too broad for the scope of this assignment.
- 4: The topic is not clearly defined.

DEPTH OF DISCUSSION

- 1: In-depth discussion & elaboration in all sections of the paper.
- 2: In-depth discussion & elaboration in most sections of the paper.
- 3: The writer has omitted pertinent content or content runs-on excessively. Quotations from others outweigh the writer's own ideas excessively.
- 4: Cursory discussion in all the sections of the paper or brief discussion in only a few sections.

COHESIVENESS

- 1: Ties together information from all sources. Paper flows from one issue to the next and makes use of headings where appropriate. Author's writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.
- 2: For the most part, ties together information from all sources. Paper flows with only some disjointedness. Author's writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.
- 3: Sometimes ties together information from all sources. Paper does not flow - disjointedness is apparent. Author's writing does not demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources.
- 4: Does not tie together information. Paper does not flow and appears to be created from disparate issues. Headings are necessary to link concepts. Writing does not demonstrate understanding any relationships

SPELLING & GRAMMAR

- 1: No spelling &/or grammar mistakes.

- 2: Minimal spelling &/or grammar mistakes.
- 3: Noticeable spelling & grammar mistakes.
- 4: Unacceptable number of spelling and/or grammar mistakes.

SOURCES & CITATIONS

- 1: At least 20 current sources, of which >90% are peer- review journal articles or scholarly books. All web sites utilized are authoritative, and an acceptable journal citation style is used in both text and bibliography.
- 2: Less than 20 current sources, and/or <90% are peer-review journal articles or scholarly books. All web sites utilized are authoritative, and an acceptable journal citation style is used in both text and bibliography.
- 3: Not enough sources used, and/or < 50% are peer- reviewed journal articles or scholarly books. All web sites utilized are credible; citation st
- 4: Fewer than 5 current sources, and/or <25% are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books. Not all web sites utilized are credible, and/or sources are not current; citation style is either inconsistent or incorrect.

Comprehensive feedback section:

Please use this section to provide comprehensive feedback on the 730 paper. What were the most notable strengths of the paper? What are the specific suggestions for improvement?

Adapted from: Whalen, S. "Rubric from Contemporary Health Issues Research Paper"
http://academics.adelphi.edu/edu/hpe/healthstudies/whalen/HED601_r2.shtml

Appendix D: Evaluation Rubrics for Preliminary Exam Process Step 2

Evaluation rubric for the DISSERTATION PROPOSAL

The dissertation proposal reflects the student's dominant research interests, and should provide a scholarly introduction to the topic (including a thorough literature review), articulate research questions or hypotheses, describe methods for answering the research questions, include preliminary results or analyses that motivate the research questions or hypotheses and support the feasibility of methods proposed, discuss the significance of the proposed work, and articulate possible outcomes and interpretations. The topic should address an issue of broad ecological or evolutionary interest and must be original. The proposal must contain a Project Summary no more than one page in length that clearly distinguishes the "Intellectual Merit" and the "Broader Impacts" of the research, followed by a Project Description between 8 to 12 pages in length, excluding references (single spaced, 11-12 point font). All figures and tables must be included in the 8 to 12 page body of the proposal.

The proposal should be evaluated on the following scale:

- 1 = outstanding (this rating should be used sparingly; element is done so well it is an exemplar, among the best from multiple years)
- 2 = very good (element is well done, among the best you typically see within a year)
- 3 = good (element is present and meets standards for a passing performance)
- 4 = fair (element is present but not as maturely developed as expected)
- 5 = poor (element is absent, superficially done, or has major flaws)

These criterion scores are designed to provide the student with detailed feedback from each committee member. While it is assumed there will generally be agreement between these criterion scores and the final rating of "acceptable", "marginal", or "unacceptable", there is no specific formula relating the criterion scores to the final rating and faculty are free to give the criteria whatever relative rating they see fit.

Project summary

- Key points of the proposal are effectively summarized
- The "Intellectual Merit" is clearly conveyed and compelling
- The "Broader Impacts" are clearly articulated

Introduction and Background

- The research area is introduced in a compelling way
- The relevant literature is fairly and thoroughly represented
- The literature is synthesized to identify critical research gaps rather than simply summarizing key papers on the topic

Research questions or hypotheses

- The research questions or hypotheses are clearly stated
- The research questions or hypotheses logically follow from the knowledge gaps identified in the introduction and preliminary results or analyses
- The importance of addressing the research questions or hypotheses is conveyed

Research design and methods

- The plans for data collection are clearly described and well-justified
- Methods that will be used to analyze the data are described and well-justified
- Rationale for the sample sizes proposed is provided (e.g., replication, feasibility, power analyses, etc, as appropriate)
- Research design and methods are appropriate for addressing the research questions or hypotheses (i.e., will the approach or method be able to answer the question?)
- Possible outcomes and interpretations presented are clear, balanced, and appropriate

Preliminary data and/or analyses

- Preliminary data or analysis is clearly presented
- Preliminary data or analysis is appropriately interpreted
- Preliminary data or analysis motivates the proposed research and demonstrates its feasibility

Overall

- Proposal demonstrates creativity and reflects novel insights
- Proposal addresses an issue of broad ecological or evolutionary interest
- Research proposed will substantially advance knowledge and understanding in the relevant field
- The proposal was well-organized, easy to read, professionally prepared (e.g., no typos), and followed the specified format
- Figures and tables were high quality, clear, easy to interpret with appropriate legends and titles, and enhanced the proposal

What were the most notable strengths of the proposal?

What were the most notable weaknesses of the proposal?

Other comments for the student, including suggestions for addressing any deficiencies identified above.

Overall, I found the proposal to be ACCEPTABLE/MARGINAL/UNACCEPTABLE.

Evaluation rubric for the SEMINAR

The seminar may focus on one specific research project, including discussion of any preliminary data or a literature synthesis, and may be more narrow than the entire dissertation proposal. Seminars must place the specific project or topic into a broader scientific context in the Introduction, present the rationale for scientific questions or hypothesis that will be answered or tested, describe the methods used or proposed, and finally place the results within the broader scientific context originally described and the overall framework of future research (i.e., the dissertation proposal). Seminars consist of a 35-40 minute public presentation followed by a 10-15 minute question period. It is imperative that the seminar fit within the allotted time.

The seminar should be evaluated on the following scale:

- 1 = outstanding (this rating should be used sparingly; element is done so well it is an exemplar, among the best from multiple years)
- 2 = very good (element is well done, among the best you typically see within a year)
- 3 = good (element is present and meets standards for a passing performance)
- 4 = fair (element is present but not as maturely developed as expected)
- 5 = poor (element is absent, superficially done, or has major flaws)

These criterion scores are designed to provide the student with detailed feedback from each committee member. While it is assumed there will generally be agreement between these criterion scores and the final rating of “acceptable”, “marginal”, or “unacceptable”, there is no specific formula relating the criterion scores to the final rating and faculty are free to give the criteria whatever relative rating they see fit.

Introduction and background material

- The research area was introduced in a compelling way
- Background information was synthesized to identify knowledge gaps that motivate the proposed work

Research questions or hypotheses

- Research questions or hypotheses were clearly stated
- Research questions or hypotheses logically followed from the introduction
- Importance of addressing the research questions or hypotheses was convincing

Research design and methods

- Research design and methods were clearly described and well-justified
- Research design and methods were appropriate for addressing the research questions or hypotheses motivating the work
- Possible outcomes and interpretations were presented and were appropriate

Preliminary data and/or analyses

- Preliminary data or analyses presented were interpreted appropriately

- Preliminary data or analyses presented supported the feasibility of the work

Summary or conclusions

- Key points of the seminar were summarized clearly
- The potential impact of the work or its implications for the field were clearly stated and compelling

Overall

- The seminar was well-organized
- The seminar was delivered well (clear voice, sufficient volume, eye contact, minimal reading from slides, etc.)
- Visual aids (figures, diagrams, movies, recordings, and tables) were high quality and easy to read or hear
- Visual aids provided key information required to understand the motivation, results, and conclusions
- Material was generally presented in a way that was accessible and interesting to a broad audience
- Answers to questions were clear, well-reasoned, and contained an appropriate level of detail

Did the seminar fit into the time allotted (35-40 minute presentation)? Yes/No

What were the most notable strengths of the seminar?

What were the most notable weaknesses of the seminar?

Other comments for the student, including suggestions for addressing any deficiencies identified above.

Overall, I found the seminar to be ACCEPTABLE/MARGINAL/UNACCEPTABLE.

Evaluation rubric for the ORAL EXAM

The oral examination is intended to develop the student's ability to discuss science with interested and knowledgeable peers. There is no standardized format for the exam, although questioning often begins with topics related to the student's dissertation proposal and seminar. Questions addressing related topics in ecology and evolutionary biology beyond the defined scope of the proposal may also be asked at any time and are expected to range widely into other areas of science. We expect that a student will demonstrate a general knowledge of biology, a good understanding of historical and contemporary ecology and evolutionary biology, and expert knowledge in the topic area of their dissertation proposal. We also expect that the student will be able to synthesize this knowledge and use it to address questions related to specific scenarios that might be new to the student. Finally, we expect the student to be able to communicate their ideas clearly, answer questions appropriately, and use schematic illustrations to supplement their verbal answers when helpful.

The exam should be evaluated on the following scale:

- 1 = outstanding (this rating should be used sparingly; element is done so well it is an exemplar, among the best from multiple years)
- 2 = very good (element is well done, among the best you typically see within a year)
- 3 = good (element is present and meets standards for a passing performance)
- 4 = fair (element is present but not as maturely developed as expected)
- 5 = poor (element is absent, superficially done, or has major flaws)

These criterion scores are designed to provide the student with detailed feedback from each committee member. While it is assumed there will generally be agreement between these criterion scores and the final rating of “acceptable”, “marginal”, or “unacceptable”, there is no specific formula relating the criterion scores to the final rating and faculty are free to give the criteria whatever relative rating they see fit.

Oral exam criteria

- Demonstrated a general knowledge of biology
- Demonstrated a good understanding of historical and contemporary ecology and evolutionary biology
- Demonstrated expert knowledge in the topic area of their dissertation proposal
- Synthesized knowledge of different topics and used it to address questions posed
- Communicated ideas clearly
- Directly answered questions
- Demonstrated strong logic and deductive reasoning skills
- Used schematic illustrations effectively to illustrate concepts when appropriate

What areas were identified as the student's strengths?

What areas were identified as the student's weaknesses?

Other comments for the student, including suggestions for addressing any deficiencies identified above.

Overall, I found the oral exam to be ACCEPTABLE/MARGINAL/UNACCEPTABLE.

Appendix E: Committee Meeting Evaluation Rubric

In addition to completing the InfoReady form, in advance of a committee meeting, students send their committee members a 1-page (or at the most, 2-page) summary of progress and plans no later than 3 days before the meeting. Once a year, the committee members will also receive a copy of the student's annual report from the Graduate Coordinator. Following the meeting, the student prepares a 1-page summary of committee recommendations regarding major steps that remain to be accomplished towards completion of the thesis, including prioritizing realistic research objectives for the next year (bulleted points are sufficient). This post-meeting summary is discussed with the advisor and modified as needed to represent their shared understanding. The post-meeting summary will be uploaded via a "progress report" in InfoReady and should be completed within 7 days of the committee meeting. The pre- and post-committee summaries and the committee meeting form will be kept in the student's file and may be considered by the GAC when evaluating students for grants and fellowships.

Rubric to be completed collaboratively by committee members:

(each category is evaluated on a scale of 1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree)

1. Research progress and plans were clearly presented in written and/or oral format.
2. Student shows a deep understanding of research area, including key literature.
3. Student has mastered the technical skills needed for their research.
4. Conclusions drawn from the research are well-supported by the data.
5. Student has made acceptable progress since the last committee meeting.
6. Research plan for the upcoming year as presented by the student is acceptable.
7. Student has made progress toward writing manuscripts and/or their dissertation.

Appendix F: Dissertation Committee Formation

In addition to administering the preliminary exam process, the dissertation committee is responsible for (1) certifying that the student has met all requirements of candidacy, (2) providing advice concerning the conduct of the thesis research, (3) monitoring progress in research, (4) providing advice on other aspects of professional development, (5) administering the final oral dissertation defense, and (6) certifying that the completed thesis meets the requirements for the Ph.D. degree.

The committee is established prior to taking the preliminary exam and must have a minimum of four members. Committee member names and roles are submitted to the Graduate Office using [this form](#). (See more, below.) Any changes in the constitution of the dissertation committee must be reported to the graduate coordinator so that a form for revising a committee may be submitted to Rackham. Rackham guidelines governing [committee membership](#) and the required Rackham Dissertation Committee Form (completed by the graduate coordinator) can be found on the Rackham website.

Composition of the Dissertation Committee:

Dissertation committees must have at least four members, three of whom are members of the Graduate Faculty (see definition below), and two of whom are from the doctoral candidate's home program. Furthermore, each committee

1. Must have a sole chair or two co-chairs;
2. Must have a cognate member who is familiar with the standards for doctoral research and holds at least a .50 appointment in a Rackham doctoral program, other than the student's home department/program (except IDP programs). Cognates must also hold a tenure-track appointment.
3. May include a University faculty member who is not graduate faculty (see definition below), a university staff member, or a qualified individual outside the university to provide expertise in the candidate's discipline.

Definition of "Graduate Faculty":

For dissertation committee purposes, "the graduate faculty" consists of persons who are tenure or tenure-track instructional faculty holding an "unmodified" (i.e., not visiting, adjunct, etc.) appointment at the University of Michigan as professor, associate professor, or assistant professor with an earned doctorate from an accredited institution.

Roles of the Chair (or Co-chairs) and Cognate Member:

Chair: The chair (or each co-chair) is responsible for guiding and encouraging the candidate's design and execution of an original, high quality, doctoral-level research project. The end result of this effort is expected to be a dissertation that makes a substantive contribution to the candidate's discipline. The chair is also expected to play a leading role in the direction of the research and of the writing of the dissertation. The chair is responsible for assuring that all investigations using human beings as subjects of research are reviewed and approved by an appropriately constituted faculty committee charged with this responsibility. If the dissertation committee needs revision, the student is responsible for notifying the EEB graduate office. At the time of the dissertation defense, the composition of the dissertation committee should still include three currently active UM members (i.e. not emeritus), although Rackham may accept having only two active members if they have previously approved the committee composition.

Cognate member: The cognate member's role is to broaden the scholarly representation of the dissertation committee beyond the candidate's home program. The cognate member also serves the graduate school and its faculty by providing a non-specialist's perspective on the quality of the dissertation.

The cognate member of a dissertation committee represents all other Rackham programs and as such must be a regular member of the graduate faculty. If possible, the cognate member should hold an appointment in a cognate or collateral discipline related to that of the student's program or dissertation topic. In this capacity the outside member provides the intellectual stimulus of a faculty member in a related field. A cognate member cannot have a budgeted appointment of 0.5 FTE or more within the EEB department. If a faculty member does not meet the requirements of a cognate member as outlined, they are to be nominated on a special assignment form detailing the qualifications for such an appointment.

Eligibility for Service on Dissertation Committees:

All nominations are submitted by the graduate coordinator, must be approved by Rackham, and are subject to the following guidelines:

1. Graduate faculty (see definition above) —i.e., professors, associate professors, and assistant professors—affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program and who hold an earned doctorate from an accredited institution may serve as a member of the committee, or as sole chair, co-chair, or cognate member.
2. Graduate faculty (see definition above) not affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program may serve on dissertation committees. They may also serve as co-chair with a member of the graduate faculty (see definition above) affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program, but not as sole chair or cognate member.

3. Instructors and lecturers who have no appointment as members as graduate faculty (see definition above) may serve on dissertation committees if they hold an earned doctorate from an accredited institution. They may also serve as co-chair with a member of the graduate faculty (see definition above) affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program, but not as sole chair or cognate member.
4. Retired and emeriti professors who were affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program may serve on dissertation committees. By Rackham rule, they may also serve as co-chair or, by special arrangement, as sole chair or cognate member. **However, by EEB rule, at the formation of a dissertation committee, emeritus professors cannot be sole chairs.** On an established dissertation committee, if the sole chair retires, EEB requires that the faculty member must change to co-chair status during their first year of retirement. Note that this EEB rule is more stringent than that of Rackham, which accepts an emeritus professor as sole chair of the committee if supplementary documentation is supplied. The student is responsible for submitting a revised [Dissertation Committee Worksheet](#) to the EEB graduate office which must be approved by the graduate chair before it is forwarded to Rackham for final approval, and a memo confirming that they have:
 - a. Experience in serving on, and chairing dissertation committees
 - b. Service as a teacher of formal courses or seminars
 - c. Served as a counselor or advisor for doctoral students
5. Research professors (RP, i.e., research professors and research associate professors) who are affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program may serve on dissertation committees if they hold an earned doctorate from an accredited institution. They may serve as a co-chair, regular member or by special arrangement as a sole chair.
6. Research scientists associate research scientists, assistant research scientists, research assistant professors, and research investigators who are affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program may serve on dissertation committees if they hold an earned doctorate from an accredited institution (see Special Membership form). **They may not serve as sole chair or cognate member.**
7. All those who do not have an earned doctorate, whether affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program or not, must be approved for dissertation committee service on a case by case basis. If approved, they may serve as a member of the committee, as the sole chair, co-chair, or cognate member.
8. University faculty and staff not included in the preceding categories and qualified individuals outside the University whose service is desirable may serve on dissertation committees, subject to review on a case by case basis. They may also serve as co-chair with a member of the Graduate Faculty (see definition above) affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program, but not as sole chair or cognate member.
9. Faculty with dry appointments: Faculty with 0% fraction appointments (dry appointments) in EEB can be co-chairs on Ph.D. and Master's committees, but cannot be sole chairs.
10. Adjunct faculty: Adjunct faculty can be co-chairs on Ph.D. and Master's committees, but cannot be sole chairs.
11. Special membership: University faculty and staff who do not fall into any of the classes

cited above and qualified people from outside U-M whose service on the dissertation committee would contribute significantly may be nominated for special membership. They may also serve as co-chair with a regular member of the graduate faculty affiliated with a Rackham doctoral program, but not as sole chair or cognate member. No person working toward a doctoral degree may serve on a dissertation committee until all requirements for the degree have been met. A special member need not be employed by U-M and need not hold an academic appointment. In addition to the Dissertation Committee Form (submitted to Rackham by the Graduate Coordinator), the following must also be supplied:

- a. A memo detailing the nominee's expertise in the dissertation topic
 - b. A CV or resume
12. In addition: No person working toward a doctoral degree may serve on a dissertation committee until all requirements for the degree have been met.
13. In addition: University faculty who were approved to serve as sole chair or cognate member but who are no longer affiliated with the University **may not** continue to serve as the sole chair or as the cognate member. The faculty member may serve as a co-chair or as a regular member based upon the eligibility guidelines for dissertation committee service.

For more information, please see Rackham's [Guidelines for Dissertation Committee Service](#).

Things to consider when selecting dissertation committee members: A good temperamental and intellectual fit between the candidate, dissertation advisor and committee can be critically important to a productive relationship. Before selecting a dissertation advisor and committee, candidates should speak with other experienced students in the program. Candidates may want to consider the following questions before deciding upon an advisor:

What is the reputation of the advisor within the field of study?
How compatible are the advisor's work habits with the student's?
How long will it take to return written materials with comments? Is the faculty member willing to serve as an editor?
How accessible is the advisor for discussion? How much time does the advisor spend away from campus?
How much freedom will be granted in the choice of a dissertation topic?
How much help will the advisor give in obtaining funding for the students?
Does the advisor have a reputation for ethical behavior and for being intellectually and psychologically supportive to students?
How long do students take to complete their degrees with this advisor, and, at least in the case of domestic students, what is the placement record of the advisor's students?

See also, [How to Get the Mentoring You Want](#), published by the Rackham Graduate School. In addition, example of sample mentoring plans can be found [here](#).

Graduate Handbook Update History (beginning Fall 2021)

8/2021: KE & NS removed 'he/she' pronouns in favor of 'they/their' pronouns

9/2021: NS updated master's handbook to remove 'traditional' terminology and to make updates in line with Rackham level changes

9/2021: NS removed reference to cognate requirement for MS students matriculating before Fall 2020 following the graduation of all such students.

9/2021: RSB incorporated formatting and grammar changes suggested by GK in May 2021

9/2021: RSB incorporated text from AD-R describing the museum GSCA funding opportunities

9/2021: RSB incorporated text describing Steps 1 & 2 of the prelims, as voted on by faculty 2/19/21 following input from faculty and students

9/2021: RSB simplified description of the PhD funding plan

11/2021: NS added Appendix with rubric for EEB 730 paper

11/2021: NS updated contact information

08/2022: NS updated contact information, links, and InfoReady forms; added committee meeting rubric to appendix

09/2022: NS Graduate Funding Resources to better reflect currently available department, Rackham, and other U-M Funding.

09/01/2022: Updated year to 2022-2023

04/11/2023: NS Added a new Research and Travel Expense Guide to consolidate information about spending policies and provide a resource for students to reference

Fall 2023: Minor language/style revisions throughout, including updating EEB 800 to EEB 701; updated links, names, and monetary amounts; clarified process around enrolling in EEB 995

Summer/Fall 2024: Graduate office and Graduate Chair made minor revisions throughout for 2024-25 AY.

Anticipated updates:

~~-Fall, 2022: NS will update information on a new process for submitting preliminary evaluations~~

~~-The GAC will consider small updates to the 730 process, following feedback from the prior year.~~

~~-Fall, 2021: GAC will develop a rubric for the 730 paper to help guide students and faculty (completed)~~

~~-Any Rackham level changes that occur~~

~~-Annual updates: Updated links, names, contact information, monetary amounts~~