

009

RECEIVED
APR 05 2013
WSU Registrar

Washington State University
MAJOR CURRICULAR CHANGE FORM -- COURSE

(Submit original signed form and ten copies to the Registrar's Office, zip 10000)

Future Effective Date: 01/01/2014
(effective date cannot be retroactive)

☐ New course ☐ Temporary course ☐ Drop service course

☐ There is a course fee associated with this course (see instructions)

- ☐ Variable credit _____
- ☐ Increase credit (former credit _____)
- ☐ Number (former number _____)
- ☐ Crosslisting (between WSU departments)
(Must have both departmental signatures)
- ☐ Conjoint listing (400/500)
- ☐ Request to meet Writing in the Major [M] requirement (Must have All-University Writing Committee Approval)
- ☐ Request to meet GER in _____ (Must have GenEd Committee Approval)
- ☐ Professional course (Pharmacy & Vet Med only)
- ☐ Other (please list request) _____
- ☐ Repeat credit (cumulative maximum _____ hours)
- ☐ Lecture-lab ratio (former ratio _____)
- ☐ Prefix (former prefix _____)
- ☐ Cooperative listing (UI prefix and number _____)
- taught by: WSU ☐ UI ☐ jointly taught ☐
- ☒ S, F grading
- ☐ Fulfills GER lab (L) requirement
- ☐ Graduate credit (professional programs only)

MBioS 593 Research Proposal
course prefix course no. title

2				
credit	lecture hrs per week	lab hrs per week	studio hrs per week	prerequisite

Description (20 words or less) May be repeated for up to 4 credits Requires written proposal and oral defense
of research project in the area of molecular biosciences.

Instructor: individually taught course Phone number: _____ Email: _____

Contact: Lisa M. Gloss Phone number: 335-5859 Email: lmgloss@wsu.edu

Campus Zip Code: 7520

- Please attach rationale for your request, a current and complete syllabus, and explain how this impacts other units in Pullman and other branches (if applicable).
- Secure all required signatures and provide 10 copies to the Registrar's Office.

L. M. Gloss 2 Apr 2013 B. K. L. 4-2-13
Chair/date Dean/date General Education Com/date

Chair (if crosslisted/interdisciplinary)* Dean (if crosslisted/interdisciplinary) * Graduate Studies Com/date

All-University Writing Com/date Academic Affairs Com/date Senate/date

*If the proposed change impacts or involves collaboration with other units, use the additional signature lines provided for each impacted unit and college.

SEP 12 2013
Catalog Subcommittee

Request to change from (A-E) graded to S/F grading

Course name/description:

MBioS 593 Research Proposal. 2 Requires written proposal and oral defense of a research project in the area in molecular biosciences. May be repeated for credit; cumulative maximum 4 hours.

Rational for change:

In April 2010, the Graduate School and Faculty Senate approved the School of Molecular Biosciences proposal to reduce the required number of graded credits from 34 to 21 hours. Concomitantly, the SMB faculty endorsed the policy that graded credit should reflect primarily didactic coursework. A major rationale for this policy change was so students' GPAs would be more reflective of objective assessment methods of academic performance and mastery of core material in molecular biosciences.

Therefore, the SMB faculty voted to convert non-didactic courses, such as MBioS 593, to non-graded (pass/fail) status. MBioS 593 is the course designation for the development and defense of the First and Second Proposals by graduate students. These proposals, constructed in the style of NIH or NSF grant proposals, are on the topic the student's thesis/dissertation research projects; the Second Proposal is a more independently developed proposal built on preliminary data collected after the defense of the First Proposal and constitutes a major component of the Advancement to Candidacy (Preliminary) examination.

While grades were assigned as objectively as possible, there was an unavoidable subjective component based on the make-up of the examining body (the student's committee and one or two representatives from the Graduate Studies Committee). The educational value and rigor of this proposal-based coursework is better served by allowing faculty to focus on constructive criticism for the writing and presentation of the proposal, rather than trying to parse the performance into the finer distinctions on a multi-point grading scale. Thus, the Pass/Fail assessment seems more appropriate and beneficial to the intent of the course.