

Drexel University College of Medicine
Neuroscience Graduate Program (PhD & MD/PhD)

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Peter W. Baas, PhD
Professor of Neurobiology and Anatomy
Director, Graduate Program in Neuroscience
Drexel University College of Medicine
2900 Queen Lane
Philadelphia, PA 19129
Telephone: (215) 991-8298
Fax: (215) 843-9082
Email: pwb22@drexel.edu

Ramesh Raghupathi, PhD
Professor of Neurobiology and Anatomy
Deputy Director, Graduate Program in Neuroscience
Drexel University College of Medicine
2900 Queen Lane
Philadelphia, PA 19129
Telephone: (215) 991-8405
Fax: (215) 843-9082
Email: rr79@drexel.edu

PROGRAM OF STUDY FOR Ph.D. IN NEUROSCIENCE

A. Course Requirements

The curriculum includes one semester of Drexel Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences and Professional Studies (GSBSPS) Fundamentals of Biochemistry and Cell Biology, two semesters of Early as Professionals (LEAP) and one semester of Responsible Conduct of Research which are shared by all of the biomedical graduate programs, together with a series of programmatic courses specific for neuroscience students. All students must participate in a seminar/discussion course (Topics in Neurobiology) in years 2-4 of the program; in later years, students have the option of registering for this course. Total number of research credits is variable for each student and will include the completion of an acceptable and publishable research project at the doctoral level (see Section G). Electives can be taken at the discretion and advice of the student's mentor and the Program Director and must be approved by the Program Steering Committee.

B. Curriculum

First Year Fall Semester	
Fundamentals of Biochemistry and Cell Biology	4
LEAP I	1
Graduate Neuroscience I	2
1st Lab Rotation	4
Total Credits:	12
First Year Spring Semester	
LEAP II	1
Medical Neuroscience	6
Graduate Neuroscience II	2
2nd Lab Rotation	4
Total Credits:	13
Second Year Fall Semester	
Neuroscience 3rd Lab Rotation (summer)(optional)	4
Graduate Neuroscience III	4
Neuroscience Thesis Research	9
Topics in Neurobiology (Journal Club)	2
Statistics for Neuro/Pharm Research	2
Total Credits:	12-17
Second Year Spring Semester	
Advanced Neuroscience (elective)	1
Advanced Motor Systems (elective)	4
Neuroscience Thesis Research	9
Responsible Conduct of Research	2
Topics in Neurobiology (Journal Club)	2
Total Credits:	14-17
Third Year and Beyond (Each Semester)	
Current Topics in Neurobiology (Journal Club)	2
Neuroscience Thesis Research or Thesis Defense	9
Total Credits:	11

Students must maintain a 3.0 GPA to continue to receive stipend support. Funding revoked due to failure of Core can resume upon re-establishing good standing, although the funds withheld will not be restored to the student. If a student receives a grade of B- or F, they may repeat the course once following approval from the Program Steering Committee. Failed courses must be repeated. Programmatic courses in which a student has earned a grade of B- may be remediated to a B upon approval from the course director and the Steering Committee. Students who fail more than one course or earn more than one grade below a B may be dismissed from the Program at the discretion of the Neuroscience Steering Committee.

Laboratory Rotations

There are three rotations in the curriculum for which the student will be assigned a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory grade. Each rotation is approximately one semester in length. The purpose of these rotations is to enable the student to be matched with the most appropriate Graduate Advisor to supervise the student. The Program Director and the Steering Committee will advise each student on the selection of rotations, as well as on the progress and outcome of rotations. Once a rotation is underway, the student and faculty member must both stay in contact with the Program Director so that any problems that arise can be addressed, and especially if the rotation is proving to be unproductive. Flexibility will be afforded in certain situations in which the Ph.D. student may be able to select an advisor before completing all three rotations, or in situations wherein it is advisable to terminate a particular rotation early in favor of another choice. **Students may NOT finalize rotations without instruction and guidance from the Program Director.** Any student who is unable to identify a mentor willing to take them before the start of the second year will not be able to continue in the Program. Please refer to Appendix #1 for a detailed description of the policies and requirements for Laboratory Rotations.

Laboratory rotations are graded on a Satisfactory (S) or Unsatisfactory (U) basis. Students receiving an “S” are rated on a performance scale ranging from Outstanding (1) to Poor (5). A “U” for a lab rotation is reserved for students that do not meet performance requirements, including attendance of the rotation as stipulated by the Program. A “U” for a laboratory rotation is grounds for dismissal from the Program.

M.D./Ph.D. students

Due to their three years of medical school preparation prior to the start of their graduate training, M.D./Ph.D. students are excused from the Fundamentals of Biochemistry and Cell Biology, LEAP I and II, Graduate Neuroscience I, and Medical Neuroscience. Due to the time restrictions on their course of study, they must complete all course requirements during their first year of graduate training. Typically, an MD/PhD student will have selected a thesis laboratory by the start of their graduate training, but if not, the student must do so by the end of the first semester of graduate training. Therefore, the three-rotation requirement is waived, and MD/PhD students must register for Thesis Research starting in their first Fall semester. They are required to take Graduate Neuroscience III and Statistics for Neuroscience/Pharmacology Research in the Fall semester and, and Responsible Conduct of Research and either Graduate Neuroscience II (for those students in a cell biology lab) or one of the Neuroscience Specialized courses in the Spring semester. All MD/PhD students must register for Journal Club (Neurobiology Topics) every semester beginning in their first semester of graduate training until they register for Thesis Defense Only (see Section H). MD/PhD students may choose to take the Preliminary Exam but must take the Qualifying Examination before the end of their first year of graduate training.

Neuroengineering Students

Drexel University has a neuroengineering focus served by two PhD programs: Biomedical Engineering (in the School of Biomedical Engineering and Health Science); and Neuroscience (in the GSBSPS). Students with a focus on neuroengineering who matriculate within the Graduate Program in Neuroscience in the GSBSPS are held to every rule and detail outlined in the present document. However, it is also understood that these students may need more flexibility in the curriculum, such as taking additional courses offered outside of the GSBSPS as well as at least one different question on the Preliminary Exam. In terms of rotations and the final choice of mentor, neuroengineering students within the Graduate Program in Neuroscience are required to select faculty members from within the program, although exceptions can be made. Neuroengineering students will be under the supervision of the Director of the Neuroscience Program, the Director of the Neuroengineering Program and Steering Committee of the Graduate Program in Neuroscience.

C. Preliminary Exam

1. The Preliminary Exam is a requirement of the Neuroscience Graduate Program. The Preliminary Examination is overseen by a Chair appointed by the Steering Committee of the Program and is given in early January of the second year, shortly after the completion of the Graduate Neuroscience III course. The exam will consist of written and oral components based on a broad knowledge of Cellular and Developmental Neuroscience, Neuroanatomy, Behavioral Neuroscience, and Systems Neuroscience. The written component will be a take-home, open-book format, wherein the students will have a week to turn in their answers. The oral component will follow within 7 days after the written exams are turned in, and questions will be based on the written answers provided by the student.
2. The Preliminary Exam will be administered by a committee of faculty members who are involved in the instruction of the programmatic courses. The questions will cover general concepts as well as specific information.
3. A grade of pass or fail will be assigned. If the student fails, they must repeat and pass the exam within two months (60 days) of failing. If the student fails a second time, they will be dismissed from the Program. Students passing but performing poorly on certain aspects of the test may be asked to remediate those particular aspects of the test.
4. There will be a programmatic “memory” of the performance of the student that will be carried forward, so that repeated demonstration of the same weaknesses in the Qualifying Exam and Thesis Proposal may be grounds for dismissal from the Program.

D. Qualifying Exam

1. The Qualifying Exam is a requirement of the Neuroscience Graduate Program and will include both written and oral components.
2. Students will take the Qualifying Exam by the end of the spring of the second year. Examination dates will be set by the Steering Committee.
3. Each student is required to write a research grant application. The total length of the document must not exceed 12 pages (not including references), single-spaced, half-inch margins, 11-point arial font. The format will be that of the most up-to-date instructions for the NIH R01. More detailed instructions can be found in Appendix 2.
4. The format of the Qualifying Exam is a mock R01 grant application based on the student's current research interests and, hence, will likely overlap with the research that will subsequently be presented in the student's thesis proposal. Detailed instructions can be found in Appendix 2.
5. The student’s mentor will take a minimal role in the process. Once the student attends the introductory lectures regarding the Qualifying Exam and grant writing principles, the student should

consult with their mentor to establish the general plan for the proposed research. The student and mentor can discuss potential hypotheses, why one topic or hypothesis might be more tractable than another, etc. From there, the mentor is permitted and encouraged to work closely with the student through the process of writing the Specific Aims page. After this has taken place, the mentor has no further participation in the process, including the crafting of the Research Strategy (Significance, Innovation, Approach sections) or the presentation.

6. The Program Director will appoint a Chair to oversee the entire process for all students in the Program. The Chair will select a committee to implement the exam; the student's mentor will not be a member of the committee, but may be asked to silently observe the oral portion of the exam. The committee will have one week to review the application, after which the student will have the oral exam, which is a defense of the document. The oral exam will generally last 75 minutes, but this can be shortened or lengthened depending on the circumstances that ensue. The student will first present a 15-minute summary and PowerPoint-presentation of their proposal, without interruptions from the committee. The 15-minute time limit will be strictly enforced. After this, the committee members will question the student for the remaining portion of the exam. The vast majority of the questions will be confined to the research proposal and the checklist, although any committee member may ask anything that seems appropriate for the discussion.

7. Based on their assessment of the document, presentation, and oral defense, the committee will vote whether the student passes, fails, or needs a major or minor revision to the document. Additionally, the committee may request an additional oral examination.

8. The student, mentor, or any member of the committee can appeal the decision to the Neuroscience Steering Committee if there are any irregularities that should be addressed.

9. If the student fails the exam, they will receive a written description of the deficiencies that led to the committee decision. If the student chooses, they may submit a formal, written remediation plan to the Chair of the Qualifying Exam committee within 2 weeks of receiving the committee's decision. The remediation plan must include a detailed description of the activities that will be undertaken to resolve each of the stated deficiencies that led to failing the Exam. Additionally, the student must provide a list of three possible faculty who were not involved in the student's Qualifying Exam, and who can act as an external advisor during the preparation for the re-examination. Further, the student's research mentor will be required to provide a letter indicating their commitment to supporting the student according to the remediation plan. The Steering Committee will consider both the student's and the mentor's statements when making plans for the student to take the Exam a second time. The student has a period of 3 months (90 days) to repeat the entire Exam process, including the formulation of a new document. Every effort will be made to ensure that the student will have the same committee members. However, the student may request a change in the committee membership if they feel that there is bias, but such requests will only be honored if the Steering Committee is convinced that such bias exists.

10. There are three instances related to failing the Qualifying Exam that will lead to dismissal from the Ph.D. Program: 1) the student does not request to retake the Exam; 2) the student does not provide a remediation plan within 14 days of the first Exam; or 3) a student fails the Qualifying Exam a second time.

11. Upon passing the Qualifying Exam, the student will be admitted to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree.

E. Dissertation Advisory Committee (see Appendix #3)

1. By six months after passing the Qualifying Exam, the student, in consultation with their advisor, will propose members of the faculty to serve on the Dissertation Advisory Committee subject to approval by the Program Director and the Steering Committee.

a. Three or four of the five voting members of the Committee must be Graduate School faculty

from the Program. To complete the five member Committee the student may select individuals who are members of the Graduate School faculty but not members of the Program or individuals who are specialists in the field but from outside the university (as approved by the Executive Committee of the Division of Biomedical Sciences). No more than 3 members of the committee (including the major advisor) may be from one Department. Committee members from outside Drexel University need to be approved by the Executive Committee of the Division of Biomedical Sciences; students should provide the Program Director with a CV or NIH-style biosketch that can be presented to the Executive Committee of the Division of Biomedical Sciences for approval.

b. Once the Advisory Committee is formed, the student and their advisor must nominate one of the committee members to be the Chair. The Chair of the Committee must not be a collaborator on the student's research project and must not have any apparent conflicts of interest related to the publication or funding of the student's project. They must also be a faculty within the Program. The student's primary advisor is a voting member of the Committee but cannot chair the Committee. Details of the role and responsibilities of the Chair are described in Appendix #3.

2. Once formed, this committee will meet every six months to review the student's progress. Following each bi-annual review by the Committee, the Report of the Dissertation committee must be completed and submitted to the Division of Biomedical Sciences.

F. Dissertation Proposal

1. The Dissertation Proposal is a crucial exercise through which each student will be thoroughly evaluated by their Thesis/Dissertation Advisory Committee to ascertain their competence and appropriateness to continue in the Ph.D. Program. The conclusion of the committee will be based on several factors (see below), which includes shortcomings displayed in any element of the Program to date and the degree to which the student has overcome these shortcomings.

2. The Dissertation Proposal document must be submitted by Ph.D. candidates within one year of passing the Qualifying Exam. In the case of M.D./Ph.D. candidates, the document must be submitted within 6 months of passing the Qualifying Exam. Under special circumstances this can be extended via written request to, and approval from, the Steering Committee. The proposal must be written in the style of an NIH R01 grant application and handed in 10 working days prior to formal presentation of the proposal to their committee. Font size, and other matters of format are precisely what are advised in the most up-to-date NIH R01 instructions, except that the page limit is 6-12 pages (to be decided by the Chair of the student's committee). Upon approval of the proposal the student will continue with their research, culminating on the presentation of the Ph.D. dissertation for defense.

3. At the time of the proposal the student must present a brief (10-15 minute) oral summary of their intended research project followed by a detailed question and answer session.

4. The advisory committee will reach a decision on the student's performance. If the decision is positive, the student may continue with their thesis research. If the decision is negative, the student can re-submit a revised or new proposal in three months and the process will be undertaken a second time. If the decision is negative a second time, the student will either be dismissed from the Program or recommended for a terminal Master's degree.

5. The decision of the committee will be based on:

- a. the thesis proposal document
- b. the oral presentation
- c. performance in the questions and answers session
- d. demonstration that the student has overcome any and all shortcomings displayed in any element of the Program to date, including the Preliminary Exam and the Qualifying Exam
- e. the committee being convinced that the student's abilities and performance in the laboratory are sufficient to actually conduct the proposed research effectively.

6. The outcome of the proposal defense should be submitted using the Report of the Dissertation committee form (appended below and located on the webpage of the Department of Neurobiology and Anatomy).

G. Publication Requirement (see Appendix #4)

The Graduate Program in Neuroscience requires that each PhD student has a publication record commensurate with the highest degree offered in academia. This means, at a minimum, publishing one first-author, original research manuscript in a peer-reviewed scientific journal deemed to be reputable by experts in the field. Achieving this important milestone prior to defending the dissertation also provides the student an invaluable training experience, as it takes the student through each step of the process, including responding to the comments of the reviewers of the manuscript. The following rules apply:

- Prior to being approved for dissertation defense, the student must have at least one first-author peer-reviewed manuscript accepted for publication. Co-first-author status is acceptable to meet this requirement.
- Review articles, chapters, commentaries, or other publications that are not a presentation of original research findings are encouraged in addition to original research papers but do not meet the criteria for this requirement.
- Requests for an exception to the publication requirement must first be deemed worthy by majority vote of the student’s dissertation committee, after which a formal request in writing is made by the Chair of the dissertation committee to the Program Director, who will seek additional counsel and approval by majority vote of the Neuroscience Steering Committee. Requests for exceptions will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and considered on the basis of the best interest of the student as well as the academic integrity of the graduate program. Requests must include a reasonable plan for the student to eventually meet the publication requirement.
- Each student and the relevant mentor and Dissertation Committee Chair must provide the relevant document with signatures (see Appendix #4).

H. Registration for Thesis Defense Only

The advisory committee will decide when the student has achieved sufficient progress and has met the publication requirement (Section G) that they may write their thesis. At that point, the Chair of the committee will complete the related section on the Thesis Committee meeting form, indicating that a student has achieved this status, which will be co-signed by the student and mentor of the student, and submitted to the Program Director for approval. The committee meeting and the signed approval forms must be received by the Program Director prior to the registration deadline for the semester. Once approved by the Program Director, the student will be registered for Thesis Defense Only credits. The student will be registered for “Thesis Defense Only” for one semester but may request to register for a second semester due to extenuating circumstances.

I. Dissertation Defense

1. A dissertation based on original research is requisite in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Ph.D. degree. The format and structure of the dissertation document is described at <https://webcampus.drexelmed.edu/BGS/forms/ThesisManual2017-2018.pdf> , and this format must be followed precisely.
2. A candidate may not present themselves for the final dissertation defense until they have completed 24 calendar weeks of residence after satisfactory completion of the Thesis Proposal, and has the approval of their advisory committee.

3. It is mandatory that students who are planning on defending their thesis/dissertation schedule a meeting with the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs who will advise them of all the deadlines and forms necessary to complete the process towards awarding the Ph.D. Deadlines for submission of completed dissertation/thesis document along with the necessary forms with signatures are posted on the Drexel University Academic Calendar.
4. The dissertation defense will take place no less than two weeks and no more than four weeks after the thesis has been distributed to the members of the Dissertation Advisory Committee, except under written direction of the Steering Committee or the Program.
5. The dissertation defense will be public. The candidate will be formally introduced by their advisor or the Chair of the Advisory Committee. The candidate will present a 45-minute seminar on their research, followed by questions from the general audience. After this initial question and answer period, the Chair will dismiss the audience. The Advisory Committee will meet in private with the candidate to complete the examination process.
6. The Advisory Committee shall decide upon the merits of the candidate's performance on the dissertation defense. To be recommended for the doctoral degree, the candidate must receive approval from at least four of the voting members of the committee. The Dissertation Advisory Committee will recommend approval for the degree to the Director of the Biomedical Sciences Division, who will have final approval. If there are more than one dissenting votes, the candidate will be rescheduled for one re-examination within three to six months.
7. If after the re-examination there continues to be more than one dissenting vote, the student is deemed to have failed the the final dissertation defense and will be recommended for a terminal MS degree.
8. A report on each dissertation defense whether passed, failed, or recommended for re-examination must be filed by the Chair of the Advisory Committee with the Director of the Biomedical Sciences Divison. The decision(s) of the Advisory Committee may be appealed to the Academic Affairs Committee.

J. Transferring from the Ph.D. to the M.S. Program

Under certain circumstances, a student may request to transfer from the Ph.D. Program to the M.S. Program or this recommendation may be initiated by the Neuroscience Steering Committee. This decision should be made prior to the Add/Drop deadline for that academic semester. The student will formalize an agreement to transfer by submitting: **1)** A letter stipulating the intent to transfer programs; and **2)** a letter of support/acknowledgement from the student's research mentor. The Program Steering Committee will vote on the request based on the documentation provided and, if approved, the Program Director will provide a letter of support recommending the transfer to the Division of Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee. Approval of transfer is not final until a letter is issued by the Director of the Division. As soon as approval is obtained, the student will no longer receive a stipend and is responsible for paying tuition.

K. Neuroscience Steering Committee (NSC)

The NSC is the governing body of the Program. It shall consist of the following voting members:

- (i) Program Director
- (ii) Deputy Program Director
- (iii) Chairs of Admissions and Recruitment for PhD
- (iv) Chair of Admissions and Recruitment for MS
- (v) At-Large member from Neurobiology & Anatomy Department

(vi) At-Large member from outside the Neurobiology & Anatomy Department

In addition, a Graduate Student Representative will participate in the Neuroscience Steering committee meetings with voice but no vote.

APPENDIX 1

Policy for Laboratory Rotations for First Year Graduate Students

The purpose of this Appendix is to clarify the procedures and goals of rotations for first year students in the Program. During orientation, the new students will be given detailed information on the purpose of the rotations and the procedures by which rotations will be implemented.

1. Experience: Rotations are expected to last for the complete duration of the semester, unless extraordinary circumstances necessitate the premature end of the rotation. Coursework is heavier during the first year with the changes to the curriculum, and hence there is less time for students to attempt multiple rotations in a single semester. In consultation with the rotation advisor, students will have necessary time and flexibility for their coursework. All students must do at least two rotations (Fall and Spring semesters), and, if necessary, a third rotation in the Summer. While there are several purposes that rotations serve (getting a taste for hands-on research, having a home base and an advisor on academic as well as research matters, gaining a breadth of different laboratory experiences, etc.), the primary purpose of rotations is to make wise and informed choices in the selection of graduate mentors for each student. By the second and possibly the third semester, the student should be in the process of making a decision regarding their dissertation laboratory.

2. Exposure: During the rotations, the student and the faculty member should be evaluating each other to make sure that they can establish a healthy, long-term working relationship; the faculty member might wind up being the primary advisor or a member of the student's dissertation committee. It is absolutely crucial that all faculty members work in harmony toward the goal of placing each student in the laboratory that is best suited for them, and that faculty members do not take a selfish approach toward "recruiting" students to their laboratories. Issues of funding, space, time constraints, and other relevant factors should be taken into account, and all aspects of the decision-making process should be open and transparent to the faculty and student body.

3. Expectation: Rotations should not be treated as mini-thesis projects. By this we mean that projects should not be designed to end up as first-author publications for the student. Also, faculty members are discouraged from designing experiments that would require the student to spend more than one semester in their lab (unless it is the second or third rotation, and the student has decided to continue in that lab for their dissertation). Grades for rotations are Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory, and a failing grade should reflect a lack of interest/attendance by the student. However, oversight by the steering committee should prevent students from getting a failing grade. Grades should not reflect the quality of the data and/or the success of the experiment. Expectations are that students will spend an average of 20 hours/week in the lab, exams permitting.

4. Execution: The Program Director will consult with faculty members and students to assist in promoting the best possible matches for the first rotation, and will finalize these decisions through contact with both the student and the faculty member. In many cases, these arrangements can be made even before students arrive for Orientation. Midway through the first semester, Program faculty will present their research to assist the students in deciding on potential second and third rotations. **Students may NOT finalize rotations without instruction and guidance from the Program Director.**

5. Evaluation: Rotation evaluations begin with an initial meeting between the faculty member and student where the goals of the rotation are described. Midway through the rotation, the faculty member and the student will meet and review the progress. At the end of the rotation, the student and faculty member

must complete the evaluation form. At all stages of the evaluation, the form must be signed by both the student and the faculty member and then sent to the program director for approval.

APPENDIX 2

Policy and Procedures for the Qualifying Exam for Second Year Graduate Students

GENERAL GUIDELINES

The aim of the Qualifying Exam is to determine whether the student is qualified to continue in the Ph.D. Program. In order to pass, the student must receive a favorable vote of the members in the examination committee. If a student fails to pass the qualifying examination, the student will be provided one additional opportunity to take the examination. The student must successfully complete the second exam within 3 months of the failed qualifying examination with a new proposal.

There are three steps for the successful completion of the qualifying exam:

Step 1. Submission of a written grant proposal by the deadline as instructed.

Step 2. Oral presentation and defense of the grant proposal to the designed examination committee. At the end of step 2, the examination committee will provide a favorable or an unfavorable vote to the student. In addition, the committee will provide a written evaluation of the student's strengths and weaknesses identified during the evaluation process, related to the written document and oral presentation.

Step 3. In some cases, the student will pass without having to make any changes to the written document or without having to undergo additional oral questioning. In other cases, in order to successfully pass, a student will be asked to fully address the questions raised by the committee members. A one-page cover letter explaining how the questions are addressed and how the document is modified in response to the evaluation is needed. The letter should be submitted together with the modified document. The modified document should be highlighted by changes in **RED**. In some cases, that revised document will be sufficient; in others the student will be asked to undergo additional oral questioning and/or presentation.

THE ROLE OF THE STUDENT'S DISSERTATION ADVISOR

The format of the Qualifying Exam is a mock R01 grant application based on the student's current research interests, and hence will likely overlap with the research that will subsequently be presented in the student's thesis proposal. The student may avail themselves of the knowledge, resources and insights from their mentor's lab that have contributed to bringing their project to where it is. However, the document should be entirely written by the student, with no new input from the advisor or faculty other than the Chair of the Qualifying Exam Committee. Importantly, the studies proposed cannot be a mere reflection or minor extension of the mentor's research program, but rather must be designed in such a manner that the student is able to demonstrate: 1) a comprehensive understanding of the field; 2) a creative approach to important questions in the chosen area of research; and 3) critical thinking skills associated with experimental design, expected results, data interpretation, and understanding of potential pitfalls and hurdles that may be encountered in conducting the research. Therefore, although the topic is ingrained within the framework of the student's ongoing research, the Qualifying Exam must incorporate experiments and concepts that the student has not discussed with their mentor. The goal of this approach is to provide a venue through which the student is able to demonstrate their potential and independence for scholarly inquiry.

The student's mentor will take a minimal role in the process. Once the student is given the introductory talk regarding the Qualifying Exam, the student should consult with their mentor to establish the Specific Aims for the proposed research. The student and mentor can discuss potential hypotheses, why one topic or hypothesis might be more tractable than another, etc.

Specifically, the rules are:

- There should be agreement on the research plan between the student and mentor, including the Specific Aims. If, after discussing the Specific Aims with the Chair of the Qualifying Committee, the student would like to revise them, the student is encouraged to further consult their PI. Once the Specific Aims are finalized, the mentor will no longer be part of the process and should not be consulted by the student or, in any way, impose on the process.
- The mentor should not edit or correct the Research Strategy of the written proposal (i.e. Significance, Innovation and Approach sections) scientifically, grammatically, structurally, or in any way. Once the proposal is submitted to the Chair of the Qualifying Exam Committee, the Chair will provide the mentor with a copy of the written document.
- The student should not practice with their mentor on the delivery of the oral presentation.
- The mentor must be aware that the Qualifying Exam is the top priority of students during the approximately 5-week period, and provide sufficient time for the student to prepare the document and prepare for the oral test. However, the student is not allowed to be totally absent from their laboratory work.
- At the time of the oral presentation, the mentor is invited to be present, but should not speak, vote, or express any opinions in defense of the student unless specifically asked or consulted by the Chair of the Qualifying Exam Committee.
- If the student and their mentor decide to submit a F31 predoctoral fellowship, the qualifying exam document can serve as a starting point or basis. The qualifying exam document must follow the format described below.
- Likewise, the Qualifying Exam document can also serve as a starting point for the Thesis Proposal. It is important to stress that the Qualifying Exam proposal need not be the same as the Thesis Proposal. The latter, which will presumably share some aspects in common with the former, will be prepared in consultation with the student's mentor and under the guidance of the student's Thesis Committee and the Chair of that Committee.

1. GRANT PROPOSAL (DOCUMENT) GUIDELINES:

Be specific, creative, informative, and avoid redundancies. Organize the grant proposal to answer these questions:

1. What do you intend to do?
2. Why is the work important?
3. What has already been done or what we know and what we don't know about the topic?
4. How are you going to conduct the project?
5. What are the potential problems/caveats for the proposed experiments? Are there any alternative approaches to address these caveats?

FORMAT (NIH R01 grant)

Font: NIH approved font (i.e. Arial, Helvetica, Georgia, Palatino), 11 points. All margins should be at least 0.5 inches

Title page: should include the name of the student (in the header, right upper corner) and the title of the proposal (maximum 56 characters, including spaces for the title), as well as mentor's name

Abstract: One paragraph, maximum 350 words.

Narrative: Medical relevance, in layman's terms. 2-3 sentences.

SPECIFIC AIMS: 1 page with 2-3 aims. State the broad long-term objectives and what the proposed research is intended to accomplish, e.g., state the specific hypothesis that will be tested. Also briefly state medical relevance or clinical implication.

RESEARCH STRATEGY: 12 pages maximum (not including the title page, abstract, specific aims, or references)

A. Significance: State why the proposed research is important and how the specific hypothesis is formulated. Keep background to a minimum, only providing what background is needed to follow the logic of the proposal. (Typically ~ 1- 1.5 pages)

B. Innovation: What is new or novel for your proposed project? This could be techniques, approaches, or the idea/perspective. What are the novel discovery and/or specific findings from this project? (Typically less than 1 page)

C. Approach: This section includes preliminary data as well as research design and methods. The student may organize this section any way that works best for the particular proposal. The student may have preliminary data in a separate section, or intermingle the preliminary data in each aim. For preliminary data for the Qualifying Exam, the student may use any data (published or unpublished) that the student or their lab-mates have produced in the mentor's lab. However, any unpublished data not generated by the student themselves must be used with the permission of the person who generated it. Figures of data published by other laboratories may also be shown in the document, if highly relevant. Please indicate in the figure legend which of these is the case, i.e. reference the source appropriately. (Please note that each figure must have its own legend).

Start each aim with a statement of rationale, which can also include a bit more background than was provided in the Significance section. Describe the research design and the procedures to be used to accomplish the specific aims of the project. Include how the data will be collected, analyzed, and interpreted. Describe the methodology and its advantage over other methodologies. Discuss the potential difficulties and limitations of the proposed procedures and alternative approaches to achieve the aims. It is important to include animal numbers, data analysis, and statistics. As part of this section, provide a tentative sequence or timetable for the project.

Timetable for a proposed project (2-3 year plan).

References – This section is not included in the 12-page limit. In-text citations should use a numerical format . The citations should include all authors, title of the publication, year of publication, the name of the journal (abbreviations allowed), and, volume of and page numbers in the journal.

Instructions for outputting your document:

- PDF file
- Title page with title, student name, supervisor name, correspondence (Department and email)
- Right side header with your name
- Insert page number: center, bottom of the page
- Page limit – 12 pages excluding Title Page, Specific Aims, and References
- Fonts and space – Ariel, Georgia, Helvetica, Palatino, 11, Single-spaced (Titles of sections can be larger font)

- Margins - 1/2 inch sides, top and bottom
- Send the document by email attachment to the Chair of the committee.
- Deadline for submission: see Table 1

2. POWERPOINT PRESENTATION GUIDELINES:

- Your presentation must last no more than 15 min: you should practice and time your presentation beforehand to ensure that it can be delivered at this time. You will not be interrupted by questions during your presentation.
- You must be prepared to respond to any questions related to your project (including technical aspects) and basic neuroscience questions in general.
- Submit your PowerPoint presentation by email the day before your exam to [the Chair of the committee](#) or bring it on a USB memory disk.

3. EXAMINATION PROCESS

1. There are 4-5 members on the committee and there is just one hour for questions. Therefore, each one of the examiners will get about 10 min to question the student. If there is a need to question the student further, we will ask their to return after the last student has finished at the end of the session.
2. After questioning, the student will be asked to exit the room and there will be a discussion by the committee members about their document and performance on presentation and questioning.
3. Importantly, the committee will point out the strengths and weaknesses that the student should pay attention to correct in their document, presentation, and oral defense.
4. Finally, the committee will provide a favorable or an unfavorable vote to the student.

APPENDIX 3 *Thesis Committee Guidelines and Chair Responsibilities*

Committee membership is approved by the Program Director and the Steering Committee.

Chair of committee is nominated by the student and their mentor from the committee membership and approved/appointed by the Program Director.

The Chair of the Committee must not be the student’s primary advisor or a collaborator on the student’s research project and must not have any apparent conflicts of interest related to the publication or funding of the student’s project. It is the responsibility of the Chair to:

- i. ensure that there is sufficient balance on the committee to ensure a rigorous and unbiased critique of the student’s project and progress.
- ii. ensure that sufficient progress is being made in the student’s research and other scholarly endeavors.
- iii. ensure that the research being conducted by the student will culminate in a high quality cutting-edge publishable body of work, and that at least a portion of it is published in a journal respected in the field of major advisor.
- iv. intervene if appropriate progress is not being made, or if there are any conflicts between the student and the major advisor
- v. report to the Program Director if there are any apparent issues or problems with any of the items listed above that can not be resolved with the student and advisor, so that that intervention can occur at the programmatic level.
- vi. when necessary, make a formal request in writing to the Program Director for an exception to the publication requirement (following a majority vote of the student’s dissertation committee).

It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Committee to be well versed in the expectations and guidelines of the Program so that the Chair can appropriately take on these duties and responsibilities.

Chair responsibilities:

- Schedule required meetings of the committee in conjunction with the student (initial meeting followed by meetings to discuss progress @ six month intervals)
 - Set agenda for the meeting
 - Conduct of the meeting
 - Student leaves the room for faculty discussion.
 - Committee reviews student progress, i.e. transcript, publications, abstract submissions, IDP
 - Initial meeting - student presents project proposal (20 minutes) followed by Q & A from the committee. The initial meeting should occur within 6-12 months after the qualifying exam.
 - Progress report meetings – student presents initial aims and documents progress on completed and ongoing aims followed by Q & A from the committee.
 - Chair moderates Q & A session
 - Student leaves the room for faculty discussion moderated by the chair.
 - Student returns and chair summarizes faculty comments and recommendations.
- Recommendations may include: “approval of project,” “request for revision of project,” “approval of progress,” “modification of project goals depending upon progress.”

- Meeting follow-up – Chair provides a written summary of the student’s performance and recommended actions including suggestions and changes to the project. Written summary is distributed to the student and all committee members. The student acknowledges in writing to accept the advice/recommendations of the committee.
- Chair insures that all required forms are signed and completed by student and committee members.
- At the end of the meeting where the committee decides that the student is ready to defend, the Chair must complete the section of the form giving permission to the student to be registered for Thesis Defense Only (TDO, see Section H). The Chair is charged with ensuring that the student has met all the conditions required to be registered for TDO.

Appendix 4: Publication Requirement Signature Form

The Graduate Program in Neuroscience requires that each PhD student has a publication record commensurate with the highest degree offered in academia. This means, at a minimum, publishing one first-author, original research manuscript in a peer-reviewed scientific journal deemed to be reputable by experts in the field. Achieving this important milestone prior to defending the dissertation also provides the student an invaluable training experience, as it takes the student through each step of the process, including responding to the comments of the reviewers of the manuscript. The following rules apply:

- Prior to being approved for dissertation defense, the student must have at least one first-author peer-reviewed manuscript accepted for publication. Co-first-author status is acceptable to meet this requirement.
- Review articles, chapters, commentaries, or other publications that are not a presentation of original research findings are encouraged in addition to original research papers but do not meet the criteria for this requirement.
- Requests for an exception to the publication requirement must first be deemed worthy by majority vote of the student’s dissertation committee, after which a formal request in writing is made by the Chair of the dissertation committee to the Program Director, who will seek additional counsel and approval by majority vote of the Neuroscience Steering Committee. Requests for exceptions will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and considered on the basis of the best interest of the student as well as the academic integrity of the graduate program. Requests must include a reasonable plan for the student to eventually meet the publication requirement.
- Each student and the relevant mentor and Dissertation Committee Chair must provide this document with signatures as indicated below.

By signing below, I understand this requirement and confirm that the doctoral student named below will be in compliance without the need for an exception.

Student Signature:

Mentor Signature:

Chair of Dissertation Committee signature:

By signing below, I understand this requirement and am requesting an exception in the case of the doctoral student named below, with an explanation provided by the Chair of the Dissertation Committee in a formal letter as stipulated above.

Student Signature:

Mentor Signature:

Chair of Dissertation Committee signature:

Appendix 5: Trainee Lunch with the Neurobiology Department Seminar Speaker

Purpose: To provide trainees with the opportunity to interact with the visiting speaker and to allow for candid discussions related to science and career in an informal format.

Expectations of all attendees:

- Respect the speaker as a guest of the department and the university.
- Represent the university, department, and program favorably.
- Be respectful and professional to other trainees and the speaker at all times.
- Be considerate of others by not monopolizing conversation and by being mindful of the purpose of the lunches.
- Follow the lead of the moderator who will strive to include the participation of all attendees.

Moderator roles:

- The moderator will be a trainee selected by the faculty host.
- Escort seminar speaker from seminar to lunch room.
- Welcome the speaker to the lunch.
- Invite the speaker to help themselves to lunch, followed by the rest of the group.
- Initiate trainee introductions and set the tone for the discussion.
- The moderator should feel empowered to direct the discussion, assist with the inclusion of all attendees wishing to participate, and redirect the discussion, if needed, away from unprofessional, confrontational, or inappropriate topics.

Etiquette:

- Allow departmental staff to set up the lunch with a clear path to the food tables.
- Allow the speaker to sit at the head of the table independently, or somewhere that they have space to view everyone comfortably.
- Utilize a second row of seats if not everyone can comfortably fit at the table.
- Allow the speaker to get food/drink first.
- Follow the lead of the moderator, with introductions of all trainees preceding questions.
- Be mindful of the speaker's time, and allow them to eat their lunch as well as participate in discussion.

Prioritized discussion points:

- Career path
- Scientific inquiries to expand knowledge and satisfy curiosities
- Perspective on the current status of their field within neuroscience
- Advice on how to navigate a career in science beyond masters/PhD
- How to negotiate when beginning a new role
- Conferences
- Work/life balance

Discussion points to be avoided:

- The speaker's personal life should be off limits, unless they initiate the topic.
- Testing or quizzing of the speaker is inappropriate.
- Long answers or explanations that stray from the purpose of the lunches.