

#### **IV: EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK; ADVISEMENT; RETENTION AND TERMINATION; AND DUE PROCESS/GRIEVANCE GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES .**

The guidelines and procedures summarized here relate to advancement of students through the CDP. The purpose of this section is to inform students of the manner in which they will be evaluated; of the procedures for student advisement; of policies regarding retention and termination; and of due process and grievance procedures.

##### **A. EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK**

The department formally evaluates student progress on evaluation forms for each course, at the end of each academic year, and at major transition points in the doctoral program: (e.g., the M.A. thesis; upon application for doctoral candidacy; on doctoral preliminary examinations; on the Major Area Paper; and the dissertation; and upon application for permission to apply for clinical internships).

Course evaluations. At the end of each semester, the members of the faculty complete coursework evaluation forms for the students enrolled in their courses. Original copies of student evaluations are forwarded to the GSAS. One duplicate copy is retained in the department and another duplicate is given to the student.

A grade of Satisfactory signifies that the student has successfully met all course expectations. The quality of the student's performance in class discussion, examinations, presentations, and other requirements is summarized in the instructor's written comments. A grade of Unsatisfactory indicates a serious deficiency and is likely to lead to a discussion about the student's ability to continue in the program. A grade of Incomplete, which signifies that the student has failed to submit all of the work required for a course, may be given only under extenuating circumstances. An Incomplete must be made up by the deadline specified by the instructor on the evaluation sheet and in accordance with GSAS rules regarding incompletes or the grade is automatically changed to Unsatisfactory. A series of Incompletes, even if they are eventually made up, may also raise concerns about a student's capacity to complete the program.

During the student's first two years in the department, it is usual for faculty members to check the box on the evaluation form labeled "too early to tell" for proceeding to the Ph.D. However, in exceptional cases a given member of the faculty may feel that a first or second year student's performance has been

so outstanding that the faculty member is already willing to recommend that the student proceed to the Ph.D. degree.

A judgment by a faculty member that a student should not be encouraged to proceed to the Ph.D. degree is taken very seriously both by the department and by the Dean of GSAS. When a student receives such an evaluation, the student's performance in other coursework is carefully reviewed. Should that performance be found to have been consistently marginal, the student may not be recommended for doctoral candidacy and may be asked to withdraw from the program (see below).

Faculty review of students. CDPP faculty discuss students' progress at several faculty meetings during the year. At the end of the year a more systematic discussion of students is conducted. These meetings are used to highlight students' achievements, to evaluate the effectiveness of elements of the CDPP program and to identify any concerns about a student's progress. Significant concerns identified by the faculty are shared directly with a student by that student's research advisor or by the CDPP director.

M.A. thesis and oral. The M.A. thesis (predissertation) is evaluated by the research advisor and by a second reader, who is selected by the student in consultation with the advisor. The advisor and the second reader evaluate the student on both the written thesis and the oral. Students must complete the M.A. thesis by the end of the second year. Those who fail to do so due to extenuating personal circumstances will not be allowed to register for third year classes or undertake the third year practicum. Once the thesis is completed, they can resume taking classes and be eligible for a practicum.

Practicum evaluations. End-of-the-year evaluation forms for CDPP students are completed by assessment and therapy practicum supervisors. These evaluations are saved in student folders and reviewed by CDPP faculty and used by the CDPP director for writing letters for internship application. Students should speak with their supervisors to insure that the evaluations are completed. It is the responsibility of students to request that practicum evaluations be sent to the department secretary after completing practica outside of the required 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year practica.

Ph.D. Candidacy. Being accepted as a Ph.D. candidate indicates that the faculty consider the student capable of successfully completing the doctorate at Bryn Mawr. If coursework evaluations and reports from the student's clinical and research supervisors indicate that the student's progress has been fully satisfactory, the candidacy form is signed by the research advisor and the program director. Students whose

eligibility for candidacy is questionable are discussed by program faculty and a decision is made as to whether the student's candidacy will be approved.

Doctoral preliminary exams. CDPP students take three four hour exams roughly a week apart. Every member of the Supervising Committee reads all examinations. The committee is then convened by the outside chair to discuss and evaluate the exams. The vote of the committee is recorded on the candidate's Ph.D. application form [i.e., candidacy form] and signed by the members of the committee. It is the responsibility of the director of the student's work to inform the student orally of the outcome of the vote taken by the committee and to provide any feedback to the student that the committee asks the director to provide. Written confirmation of the committee vote is received by the student from the Office of the Dean.

Possible votes on prelim exams are the following:

- i. "Satisfactory".
- ii. "Satisfactory except for. . ." -- to be used when one or two fields or parts of fields is not satisfactory.
- iii. "Unsatisfactory".

In the case of "Satisfactory except for," the Supervising Committee will specify what work is required to make up the deficiency and the deadline(s) for doing so. The chair of the Supervising Committee officially informs the Dean of what is required, and the Dean conveys the information in writing to the student. Deficiencies must be made up within one year of the first written examination, and before the dissertation can be submitted. In the case of one or more examinations graded "Unsatisfactory," the Supervising Committee may require the student to retake the examination(s) or may deny the student permission to continue for the Ph.D. Re-examinations must be successfully completed within one year of the first written examination. No examination may be retaken more than once.

Major Area Paper. Students write their Major Area Paper under the guidance of their advisor and submit it to their Supervising Committee by October 15 of the fourth year. A Major Area Paper deemed deficient must be revised until the committee approves it as satisfactory. Formal acceptance of the Major Area Paper is recorded on the Ph.D. candidacy form.

Dissertation. In the CDPP, the dissertation process follows multiple stages, with input from the four members of the Supervising Committee at each stage (proposal meeting, data review, review of dissertation draft, and final oral). During the proposal meeting (and subsequent meetings if required) the Supervising Committee evaluates the proposed research, makes recommendations, and ultimately endorses a research plan. At the data review, the committee can request additional analyses and suggest alternative formulations of findings, but it cannot demand that the study be redesigned or more data be collected, even if no significant results are obtained. Committee members review dissertation drafts until a version that is essentially acceptable is produced. The final oral is not held unless the Supervising Committee essentially accepts the written dissertation, except for minor revisions that can be added after the oral.

The final oral is devoted to the dissertation and the general field to which it pertains. At the beginning of the oral, the student is asked to leave the room so that the committee can confer. The committee then confirms that the dissertation is acceptable and notifies the student of this fact, and then the oral proceeds. At the conclusion of the questioning, the student is asked to leave the room so that the faculty can vote on the oral. The Supervising Committee then votes that the oral is "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory."

Internship. Before a student can apply for the clinical internship, he or she must apply in writing to the faculty for permission to do so. In this letter, the student states that she has completed all coursework, the language exam, the M.A. thesis, doctoral prelims, the Major Area Paper, and both clinical practica, and she informs the faculty about progress on the dissertation.

Although it is not currently a program requirement that a student complete the dissertation prior to beginning the internship, faculty strongly advise students to complete the bulk of their dissertation work before going on internship. Internship sites view the application of students who have not made significant progress on their dissertation as weaker than those with much of their work completed. If a student requests permission to apply for internships without having made substantial progress toward the dissertation, the program faculty have the prerogative to deny the student's request. In such a case, faculty might insist that the student wait a year before applying so as to make more progress on the dissertation. Typically, a student consults with the research advisor and the

program director about when it would be best to begin applying for internships.

## **B. ADVISEMENT**

As soon as a student selects a research advisor (by September 15 of the first year), this faculty member becomes the student's advisor. In addition to supervising the student's research, this mentor is available to discuss any concerns the student may have about the program, his or her performance, or research, clinical, and teaching goals.

As they begin to make plans for their Major Area Paper in the third year, students may decide that their research interests have changed and/or that they wish to affiliate with a new research mentor. The CDPP does not require that students stay with the same advisor throughout their years in the program, although many students elect to do so.

The program director is also available as a general advisor for all CDPP students.

## **C. RETENTION AND TERMINATION**

In admitting a student to the CDPP, the department makes a general commitment to support that individual through to completion of the Ph.D. For example, faculty members provide detailed feedback designed to assist students to remediate unsatisfactory coursework or poor preliminary exam performance. Students whose skills in assessment or therapy need strengthening are provided with additional close supervision and are offered supplemental training placements. When students' personal life circumstances interfere with timely progress toward the degree, they can submit a written request explaining the reasons for their altered timetable and proposing a slower timetable for completion of the degree. In such cases, the faculty endeavor to strike a balance between support of students to whom they have made a commitment and maintenance of program standards.

Only a few students have been asked to withdraw from the CDPP. In these cases, performance in coursework, on prelim exams, in research or in clinical placements was very weak. Students whose coursework and predissertation performance are marginal or deficient may not be approved for doctoral candidacy. Such a student would then leave the program with a terminal M.A.

Although all students are expected to make continuous progress toward the degree, there are, prior to preliminary

examinations, no GSAS rules specifying time limits for the completion of the degree. However, once a student begins to take field exams, the student has five years (60 months) from the first exam to complete the dissertation. If the student fails to complete the dissertation within five years of taking prelims, GSAS rules state that the student must retake one prelim exam, unless a special waiver of this rule is requested by the department because the student has been actively working in the field during this period.

#### **D. DUE PROCESS AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.**

If a student feels that he or she has been unfairly treated or evaluated, he or she is encouraged to broach this subject with the faculty member involved, with his or her research advisor, or with the program director. The Dean of the GSAS is also available to confer with doctoral students who are encountering difficulties or who wish to discuss concerns about their experience at Bryn Mawr. Students who have proceeded to the doctoral exam level can also utilize the Chair of the Supervising Committee as a resource, should they have some concern about how members of the Supervising Committee have treated them. The "outside chair" is always a faculty member from another department on campus, and it is his or her role to see that the policies and procedures of the GSAS are followed and that the student receives fair treatment.

According to the rules of the GSAS, if a department recommends to the Dean of the GSAS that a student not continue in the program, the Dean notifies the student of this decision. The student has the right to appeal this decision to the Council of the GSAS, which includes the Bryn Mawr College Provost. The Graduate Council will hear both the student and the department and make a decision in the case, which is binding. Additional GSAS policies with regard to "Exclusion or Non-Continuation" are contained in the GSAS catalogue.

Bryn Mawr College is firmly committed to a policy that prohibits discrimination based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and sexual orientation. In the event that a student feels he or she has been discriminated against, the College has procedures that are to be followed in order that such grievances will be resolved quickly and equitably for all concerned parties. These procedures are described in detail in the College's undergraduate student handbook.

## **V. GUIDELINES FOR STUDENTS**

### **A. RESEARCH SUPERVISION**

Research supervision can be one of the most rewarding aspects of graduate education. Listed below are some strategies for maximizing the effectiveness of the supervision process and making it as rewarding as possible.

- i. Be prepared and organized. Begin supervision by summarizing issues raised at the previous meeting, describing what was to have been accomplished since the last meeting, what actually has been accomplished, and what is still to be done;
- ii. Copy any articles a supervisor might want to read and give them to her/him at least a week before you expect to discuss them. Be prepared to summarize the articles in the event that the supervisor has not had time to read them;
- iii. Do not arrive at a supervision hour with an undigested mass of raw data. Prior to supervision, organize any data to be discussed. Present data in tabular form. Arrange the various tables in logical order as they would appear in a results section of a journal article.
- iv. Bring two copies of any manuscripts that a supervisor is expected to comment on during the session. Annotate one copy as the commenting proceeds. This will save the trouble of later having to decipher the supervisor's handwriting;
- v. Proofread carefully. A research supervisor should not have to spend time correcting spelling and/or typographical errors;
- vi. Be familiar with and use APA format from the outset. Supervisors should not have to make format corrections;
- vii. Ask your supervisor if it is OK to tape supervisory sessions if you want to review material at a later time;
- viii. Attend research groups consistently. Success of the group research process is closely related to the consistency with which members participate;

### **B. RESEARCH PUBLICATION**

Research results are to be shared with the scientific community. The eventual goal of all research is publication. Faculty members are eager to assist students in the publication process. Learning how to navigate the process or publication is an important skill for students to acquire.

### C. AUTHORSHIP

Authorship on publications should also be discussed with one's advisor and other research collaborators. The primary guidelines governing authorship are those incorporated into the APA Ethics Code for Psychologists:

"Principal authorship and other publication credits accurately reflect the relative scientific or professional contributions of the individuals involved, regardless of their relative status. Mere possession of an institutional position, such as department chair, does not justify authorship credit. Minor contributions to the research or to the writing for publications are acknowledged appropriately, such as in footnotes or in an introductory statement. Except under exceptional circumstances, a student is listed as principal author on any multiple-authored article that is substantially based on the student's doctoral dissertation. Faculty advisors discuss publication credit with students as early as feasible and throughout the research and publication process as appropriate."

In principle, these guidelines seem straightforward. In practice, however, situations arise in which the application of these guidelines can be challenging. Whenever a student is in doubt about who should or should not be included in the authorship of a paper or about order of authorship, the best procedure is to discuss the matter openly with those (faculty and fellow students) who may be involved.

Although rules of thumb are just that and no more, the following guidelines, flexibly employed, may facilitate the process of deciding upon authorship:

- i. Authorship (including order of authorship) should be discussed during the planning stage of any research project and reconsidered whenever the nature of the collaboration changes.

- ii. Anyone regularly participating in a given research program who has made an original, substantive, intellectual contribution to research within that program should be given authorship when that research is reported. Thus, for example, anyone who makes a substantive contribution to the formulation of the problem, to the design of the research, or to the theoretical interpretation of the results ("substantive" here means that the problem, design, or interpretation would have been noticeably different without the contribution) should be included among the authors of the paper reporting the research.

Similarly, anyone who makes a substantive contribution to the writing of the article to be submitted for publication should receive authorship.

iii. Participation in the research which does not qualify as an original, substantive, intellectual contribution does not generally merit authorship. Examples of contributions of this sort might include routine data collection, data reduction, statistical consultation, the routine performance of statistical analyses, and routine editorial work. Typically, assistance of this form is recognized in a footnote.

iv. Since it is generally in the nature of faculty supervision of student research, even of dissertation research, that the faculty member is called upon to make an original, substantive, intellectual contribution to the research, it can usually be assumed that students and faculty will co-publish supervised research. When, in the course of the research, other students or researchers make substantive contributions as well (typically, such contributions are over and above the usual level of cooperative brainstorming that is routine in the research group process), their contributions should also be recognized through joint authorship.

v. Order of authorship is usually a function of the relative importance of the original, substantive, intellectual contribution which each author has made to the research. Order of authorship does not routinely follow the relative amount of time and/or energy expended by the several authors. Thus, for example, a student whose M.A. thesis develops a problem already explicit in a faculty member's research, using a methodology and an interpretive framework pioneered by the faculty member, should not necessarily expect first authorship on the article reporting that research. This is true even if, relative to the supervisor, the student contributed more time to the project.

vi. Dissertation research, although frequently collaborative and by the above criterion appropriately co-publishable, is by its very nature typically the original, substantive, intellectual contribution of the student. The student generally should expect first authorship. In those instances in which a student's research skills are sufficiently advanced that the student develops a problem, design, and interpretation largely on her/his own and involves the supervisor only in the role of critical reactant, the article reporting the dissertation research should be solely authored by the student. Occasionally a dissertation may develop a problem already explicit in a faculty member's research as described above (v.) or utilizes data previously collected by a faculty

member or other researcher. In these cases, there should be explicit discussion between the student and faculty member (and other researchers) at the beginning of the collaboration about the order or authorship on any publications.

#### **D. WRITING GUIDELINES**

For all written assignments, proposals, and theses, it is expected that students will submit only typed or printed copy, that they will use APA style, that references will be complete and correctly formatted, and that papers will be carefully proofread for typographical errors. Whether or not a student intends it, sloppy work is easily interpreted as indicating shallow commitment.

##### **a. Outline of Major Area Paper**

In the Major Area Paper, the student will need to pose a question, identify the literature that will be reviewed, and explain how this literature helps to address/answer the question posed. Students must obtain approval for their Major Area Paper by outlining each of these aspects of the planned paper. The question asked should demand an integration of the literature in an original way and should in principle be capable of yielding a tentative answer. General questions such as "What do we know about X (e.g. early morality, language delays, Down syndrome, social cognition in the pre-school years, enmeshment, etc.)?" are generally not sufficiently focused and usually lead to a textbook-like recitation of current research that does not propel the student or research forward. More focused questions about relationships among concepts, theories, and bodies of research (e.g., what is the influence of family structure on social cognition?; what aspects of early language ability lead to reading disability?) will lead to a more probing and analytical examination of the literature. When you outline your Major Area Paper to your advisor you should include an argument for the value of pursuing the question proposed and make specific reference to the literature that will be discussed in the paper. You should also indicate what areas of the literature you intend to review. The Major Area paper has no specific page guidelines, but they typically run between 25 and 35 pages, double-spaced.

##### **b. Writing predissertation & dissertation proposals**

A research proposal should include a clear and convincing argument that the proposed research: a) will make a contribution to knowledge; b) is appropriate in size and scope,

and c) can be effectively carried out by the student. One of the most common problems with proposals is that they attempt to summarize work done already and work proposed without adequately addressing the three points above. The proposal is an **argument for** the proposed work.

While a proposal must clearly and thoroughly describe the proposed research, it must also JUSTIFY the research in terms of its VALUE, VALIDITY, and FEASIBILITY. For any proposed research, the proposal should:

1. explicitly state the question that will drive the research;
2. place this question in the context of relevant theory or prior research (e.g., identifying how the proposed research complements the existing literature);
3. outline, if possible, the answers that the research might produce (this can take the form of formal hypotheses, but does not need to do so);
4. describe the research design, methods of data collection, and the plan for data analysis;
5. defend and justify any of these items if their importance or merit are likely to be questioned.

The proposal should begin with a literature review that summarizes the research relevant to the topic and conclude with a rationale for why the proposed study is needed. This rationale then prepares the reader for the methods proposed. The literature review should be no longer than is necessary to argue the value of the proposed research and place it within a context of prior thought and findings. You can think of this portion of the proposal as "citation-supported logic".

The method section should not only fully articulate the methodology but argue its appropriateness for the proposed research. It is important to give details of the research procedure or, where developing this procedure is part of the study, to describe the process by which the procedure will be developed. For example, if you cannot specify coding categories until you've collected data, then the procedures for developing the categories should be described. Explain the rationale for your choice of methodology (e.g., surveys, interviews, case studies, observations, etc.). Describe the nature of the research setting, sample, and data to be used. Describe each instrument in some detail, including sample items of a questionnaire or a schedule for behavior observation. Remember to also explain how the proposed work can disconfirm alternative explanations.

CDPP students ***need to have their research reviewed by the Bryn Mawr IRB***, which is charged with protecting the rights and welfare of participants in research. IRB forms and information are available on the web at:

<http://www.brynmawr.edu/grants/irb/>

### **c) Writing the Master's Thesis and the Dissertation**

Both the predissertation and the Ph.D. thesis should present an in-depth literature review, a description of the methodology used, a detailed presentation of the results, and a comprehensive discussion of those results. There are no page length requirements for theses. Expectations about length should be discussed with one's faculty advisor.

***Students should obtain and assiduously follow the GSAS guidelines for preparation of the dissertation.*** The CDPP requires that M.A. theses have a title page, an abstract, and the typical features of an academic psychology article (references, tables, appendices as necessary, etc.).

Committee members, second readers, and advisors may ask you to rewrite passages, to correct typographical and/or spelling errors, as well as to reprint the entire thesis if the final copy needs such corrections. In such cases a thesis will be "passed" on the condition that the corrections are made within a time specified by the advisor.

## **E. STUDENT FEEDBACK TO FACULTY**

Student feedback to faculty is an important element in the program's ongoing self-assessment and improvement. Student feedback to faculty takes a variety of forms. First, students complete an anonymous course evaluation form at the end of each course. Faculty members are given the packet of completed forms for a course after they have turned in the grades and student evaluations for that course. These student comments provide important feedback to department faculty about the quality of their teaching, the intellectual merit of their courses, and the atmosphere in the classroom. These comments are also used in regular reviews of faculty performance that are conducted by the Provost and a special committee at Bryn Mawr composed of faculty from other departments.

The CDPP is a small program in which open communication and free discussion of issues are encouraged. In addition, as a clinical developmental psychology program, the CDPP hopes to train its students to be able to acknowledge tension, misunderstanding, or conflict in a sensitive way and to be able to take adaptive steps to deal with such situations. Thus,

students who are having difficulty with a faculty member or program matter are encouraged to bring the matter up in discussion with that faculty member. The CDPP program director can also be approached to discuss concerns about particular faculty members or program issues.

Faculty members are assigned to act as facilitators for each of the first 4 classes and to students in the fifth year and beyond. The faculty facilitators and students in that cohort meet periodically during the year to review student concerns and questions. The faculty facilitators will communicate any concerns and questions to the rest of the CDPP faculty and the CDPP Director.

CDPP students are actively involved in the recruitment of new students and faculty. They participate in the interview process for prospective students and give input to faculty about their impressions of candidates. In this role, they represent the CDPP, exemplify its model, and articulate its philosophy and practices to applicants. Students also are involved in the faculty search process. They review CVs of job candidates, attend job talks, meet with candidates, and give feedback to faculty about their impressions. These kinds of involvement lead to students giving feedback to faculty about the degree to which the candidates in question seem to be compatible with the goals, objectives, and mission of the CDPP.

Periodically, the CDPP faculty seek explicit feedback about the program from current students in formal meetings or by means of a questionnaire.

#### **F. DEPARTMENT AND PROGRAM MEETINGS**

CDPP students are expected to attend the Research Brown Bag lunch meetings that are held Wednesdays at noon. During these meetings, students talk about their research activities and various research-related topics of general interest are discussed (e.g., ethical conduct of research, using PsychLit, new developments in stat packages, important new studies, etc.). Attendance at this weekly meeting is required for first, second and third year students, but more advanced students should also make every effort to attend.

Students in the CDPP should plan to attend departmental colloquia. This is an important department function and provides an opportunity for CDPP students to hear about research in the field of psychological science more broadly.

Students should also try to attend the Clinical Brown Bag. First- and second-year students, in particular, will benefit from the opportunity to learn about and discuss clinical cases.

This meeting is generally held on Wednesday evenings twice a month. At this informal meeting, faculty, students and guest clinicians present therapy and assessment cases and discuss topics such as diagnosis, case formulation, test interpretation, treatment implications of assessment findings, treatment goals, therapy methods, and issues of therapy efficacy.

CDPP students are expected to present their research at the annual Graduate Student Research Symposium. All students are expected to attend.

The CSI Psychologists Meeting provides an opportunity for students working at CSI to meet with the staff psychologists at CSI. The meeting is used for case presentations; visiting speakers; and discussion of current issues in the field, research, new instruments, or clinic policy.

#### **G. PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Students are encouraged to join the student divisions of APA, APS, PPA, SRA, SRCD, ABCT and other organizations related to their particular research interests. Students should make every attempt to attend the biennial conference of SRCD, as well as the Pennsylvania-based meetings of the PPA. Masters theses and dissertations are all likely to be accepted for presentation at one of the major conferences. Students should consult their advisor with regard to conference submissions. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences can often contribute substantially to student travel if the student is presenting at a conference.

#### **H. FACULTY LEAVES**

Faculty leaves always cause a certain amount of disruption in student planning. The department is aware of this and makes every effort to minimize this disruption. In this process, however, it is important to keep the following general principles in mind:

a. Faculty leaves are an important form of faculty development. Leaves are costly both to the College and to the Department. These costs are borne willingly because faculty members who are given time to think, to learn, and to write are in a position to increase their contribution to the intellectual life of the College. Although faculty leaves can cause short-term disruption in student planning, the long-term gains to students from faculty leaves far outweigh the disadvantages. Freshness of approach and renewed enthusiasm in the classroom, greater clarity of research goals, and increased professional visibility on the part of faculty are among the more obvious benefits.

b. Students whose work is being directed by a member of the faculty who is going on leave should consult with that faculty member to develop a plan that will minimize disruption in the student's program of study while her/his director is on leave. When necessary, this plan should include some arrangement for substitute research supervision by another member of the faculty, since faculty who are on leave are expressly advised by the College to remove themselves from the normal routine of student supervision even if they choose to spend a portion of their leave locally. Thus, the presumption on the part of a student approaching a supervisor about to go on leave should be that the faculty member will be unavailable for student contact during the term of the leave. Only in exceptional circumstances to be worked out individually between student and faculty advisor might a faculty member on leave choose to continue to meet with a student during the leave.

c. Preliminary examinations are not read by members of the faculty who are on leave. However, in order to minimize disruption in the examination procedure, when a faculty member who is typically responsible for setting the preliminary examination for a particular field goes on leave, that faculty member is asked to prepare the examination to be given in her/his absence before she/he departs.

d. Faculty on leave are not expected to sit on dissertation committees, attend proposal meetings, or participate in final oral examinations. When it is expected that a student's committee will meet during a committee member's leave, the student should consult with the director of work about a replacement for that committee member.

