

Curriculum Committee Meeting
Reynolds Conference Room-2401
October 17, 2023
8:30am - 10:30am
Zoom: <https://tulane.zoom.us/j/95434937094>

Minutes

Committee Members in Attendance: Dr. Felicia Rabito (FR), CC Chair; Dr. Yaozhong Liu (YZ), BIOS Rep; Dr. Stephen Murphy (SAM), ENHS Rep; Dr. Aaron Hoffman (AH), EPID rep; Dr. Mark Diana (MD), HPAM Rep; Dr. Dominique Meekers (DM), IHSD Rep; Dr. Sarah Michaels (SRM), TRMD Rep

Ex Officio and Advising Attendees:

Dr. Christine Arcari (CA), Sr. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Susan Cantrell (SC), Senior Academic Records Administrator

Other Faculty in Attendance:

Susan Cheng (WSC), Richard Priore (RP), Nhu Ngoc Phan (NNP), Maya Begalieva (on behalf of David Seal, SBPS rep)

Not in Attendance:

David Seal, Emma Holsberg/Akilesh Kandregula, Dr. Katherine Andrinopoulos, Patricia Scaraffia

- I. September 19, 2023, Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes.** FR tabled review of the minutes for updates on CA's discussion on changes to Certificate policy. A poll will be sent to the CC after the meeting to vote.

II. Curriculum Review

A. Course Review

- a. TRMD 7800 Advanced Medical Entomology** submitted by Patricia Scaraffia for standard review. The course review contains significant modifications effective for Spring 2024. The peer reviewers are Dominique Meekers and Aaron Hoffman.
- i. DM suggested changes included error on Step 3 form in Section 2 Admissions and Scheduling was set to 2 hours per meeting. This was updated to 2 hours and 30 minutes per class period. Section 4 Explanation of Evaluation Methods, 'feedback through self-assessment' is not how students are graded, this was removed. In Grade Components, 80% for proposal and presentation was split up 70% on the proposal and 10% on the presentation—this was updated on the syllabus but not on Step 3. DM also requested percentages for grades, and this was updated. In the Syllabus, the first LO learn was requested to be modified according to Bloom's Taxonomy. In the first signature activity, DM would like to see how the student has mastered the LO. In the revised version, this is addressed better but it is still vague. FR agreed the LO needs to be more specific, and

the signature activity will address how the LO is being tested. Also, a rubric will show what students are measuring. This needs to be updated. The second LO also includes class participation which does not show how the student has achieved the LO. This was revised but DM was concerned with the vagueness.

- ii. SRM asked if an in-class assignment would count for the class participation. FR noted the listed LOs are too broad and the LOs should be specific to this course. DM suggested listing a topic of the small problem situations would be helpful. CA added the LOs should come from the descriptions, for example bioassays, bioinformatics, ecological behavioral and surveillance experiments. The LOs should touch on what the instructor says is taking place in the course. SRM asked if the class time and the way it is offered is, ok? CA noted SPHTM does not have any rules about lab hours like didactic courses. It's a 3 credit, 8-week course, meeting 2 days per week for 2 hours and 45 minutes with a 15-minute break.
- iii. DM continued with LOs 3-7 were more specific in the revised version. However, the signature activities need updating. In the first rubric (class participation 20% of grade), is vague since it covers so many different areas. The ratings reveal whether students are active or not, but it does not reveal if the students have mastered their LOs. LO 5 is vague but it contains a written proposal (signature activity) that is clearer since students are defining a topic. In the Assessment and Grading Policy, class participation is defined as 20%, which incorporates a lot of activities and is suggested to be split up. In the first rubric-- class participation is exceptionally vague because it covers a lot of different areas. DM continued there are 2 basic types of assessments: a level of engagement in the class and the frequency of participation in the class and class behavior. This is rated, 1.) exceeded expectation; 2.) meet expectation; 3.) below expectation. The rating only reveals if the student is active or not, not if they have mastered the LOs. The ratings are too vague. In addition, there were inconsistencies with the schedule. The description of the LOs and the LO table were different and needed to be updated in all areas.
- iv. AH noted the single rubric being used for 2 components that were different percentages. There are 2 rubrics now but it's still confusing. In the class participation rubric, there are point totals in the rows as well as the columns

now, but they do not align correctly. AH suggested taking each of the components and talking about them separately.

- v. CA noted class participation should not be a signature activity. LOs 1-2 are only tracking class participation and it should be pulled out and be more specific. CA suggested focusing on the in-class activities, then the assessment could be an in-class quiz or specific activity, then grade this in a different way.
- vi. SRM asked if the broad LOs need to be included. CA suggested getting rid of LO 1-2 and making sure the LOs are aligned with the course description.

DM made a motion to table the course; AH seconded the motion. All in favor—motion carried by majority quorum (DS was not present to vote).

b. SPHL9920 Practice Based Portfolio: Background submitted by W. Susan Cheng for initial offering in Summer 2024. The peer reviewers are Yaozhong Liu and Mark Diana.

- i. CA noted this course is 1 of 3 course that will support the products of the practice-based dissertation for the DrPH students. It is didactic research hours and will constitute as the culminating experience for the DrPH program. It is the equivalent of the dissertation.
- ii. YZ noted this was a well-prepared course with minor concerns. The Step 2 form lists prerequisite as “foundational DrPH courses” and it is suggested to list out the courses instead. The final grade components are not consistent with the syllabus. For example, Discussion/Participation makes up 40%, while in the syllabus it only contributes 30% of the overall grade. Also, there is also a grade “D” that was suggested to be removed. In the syllabus, LO2 is inconsistent with the step 2 form, where the verb is “investigate” rather than “evaluate”. Participation and discussion make up 30% of the overall grade. While a rubric is provided to evaluate discussion, YZ would like WSC to specify how participation contributes to the grade. For example, how does a full attendance of live sessions have an impact to the participation grade as compared to a half attendance. WSC revised all the except the prerequisites and the specification of how the participation contributes to the grade.
- iii. FR noted that students do not have to attend live sessions, it is not a requirement. YZ added if there is a full participation for the live sessions that

will contribute to the participation grade component which makes up 30% of the overall grade.

- iv. MD added he did not have anything to add. In regard to participation, it is subjective and asked for guidance (i.e., template rubric, guidelines) to help facilitate this. FR added she would prefer the CC not be prescriptive with guidelines due to course difference. The guidance she can recommend is that because this is subjective, we should request a rubric. FR asked if she was a student and did not attend the live sessions would she get a 0 for class participation?
- v. WSC noted in the rubric she needs to remove the words “in live”. Professionally, in general, should be an important part of how they construct their responses, whether that is on discussion boards asynchronously or in-person. WSC added verbiage to the paragraph above “Attendance in live session is not required while engagement during live sessions is helpful to achieve a deeper understanding of the course content, participation and engagement are not graded or recorded.” Live sessions are not mandatory and is not graded whether a student is there or not.

YZ made a motion to approve with a minor modification to remove “in live” be removed from rubric, AH seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried by majority quorum (DS was not present to vote).

- c. **HPAM 7460 Business of Health Care Economics** submitted for initial offering for Summer 2024. The peer reviewers are Stephen Murphy and Dominique Meekers.
 - i. DM started by asking the committee if the course met the contact hours. DM suggested finding a way to report this on the form.
 - ii. DM continued with comments on Step 2 form LO3 asked RP to rephrase the assessment. LO3 should list the business case analysis since this part is graded. RP updated this in the syllabus but will change it in Step 2. In Explanation of Evaluation Methods, several suggestions were provided such as rewording methods, specificity of how students are graded for accreditation purposes, and updates to match syllabus. Some of this was updated in the revised materials. DM suggested deleting the row with the didactic lessons and discussion forum because they are not part of the grade. In the Final grade components, DM suggested updating wording to match syllabus (Model 1 and Model 6) and questions surrounding the optional questions in Bonus Trivia that equals to a percentage. This was

updated in the revised materials. DM asked RP to be more specific and/or give examples of the statement listed in Health Disparities and Cultural Competence Addressed. **The question was raised what does this mean?**

- iii. In the syllabus, DM suggested RP to match the LO table to the Step 2. This has been addressed. DM suggested copying the Methods of Evaluation table from the syllabus and adding it to Step 2. DM noted the expected time in Weekly Workflow Guide was very helpful. It could be used to document how distance learning courses meet the credit hour requirements. DM added there should be a column that shows which of the LOs each module addresses.
- iv. SAM questioned the 7000-level course, and it used the phrase “Introductory”. For accreditation purposes, this was a concern. This was updated. In addition, the objective terminology was updated to be more aligned with higher learning as opposed to master’s level coursework. LO2 seems incomplete after the rephrasing. RP noted “making” should be deleted; he will make this edit. Also, the syllabus Methods of Instruction reads “multi-modality”. Is synchronous and asynchronous two different modalities?
- v. CA noted this is incorrect, asynchronous, and synchronous is not 2 different modalities. CA asked if the discussion forums are synchronous? The students are on for 1 hour each week discussing the forum.
- vi. RP commented these are live forums that take place every other week. The purpose is to lend color to all the lessons discussing the material that has been covered. Its small breakouts facilitated by Dr. Priore.
- vii. CA suggested changing this to “live session forums” or similar so there is no confusion.
- viii. FR questioned what is required/not required.
- ix. CA suggested adding an attendance policy in the syllabus. There are some online sessions where we need a grading component in a live session. The following must be included in the attendance policy:
 - 1. You can only have up to 25% of your set live sessions required.
 - 2. You can only require a live session if there is a grading component to it.
 - 3. And you must offer an alternate assignment for students that cannot attend the live session.

4. In the syllabus' attendance policy, it must read "the following live sessions are strongly encouraged...". Verbiage for this went out and CA will resend.
- x. AH noted in the Grading Distribution for the points that correspond to each letter grade, its ambiguous, and should be changed to "<F" rather than "< or equal to F."

DM made a motion to approve with minor revisions. SAM seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried by majority quorum (DS was not present to vote).

Update on November 13, 2023, the name of HPAM 7460 has been changed to **Managerial Economics for Health Care**.

- d. **IHSD 7340 Population Mobility and Health** submitted by Nhu Ngoc Pham for standard review. The course review contains significant modifications effective for Fall 2024. The peer reviewers are David Seal and Sarah Michaels.
 - i. NNP noted this is an existing course, with a new instructor, changing departments from SBPS to IHSD; in addition to moving from a 2-credit hour to a 3-credit hour.
 - ii. DS raised a question regarding Course Evaluation and how, as a new primary instructor, will the common critiques or suggestions for improvement be addressed. In the Grading Rubric Criteria points are somewhat unclear across the top row. You will need to explain to the students that these criteria apply to each separate category in the columns. In the Syllabi, it was suggested to select a level of 3 or 4 verbs for an MPH class. This also applies to the course review form. DS also suggested considering embedding footnotes directly into the exercise description for the ease of student reading. DS suggested updating some reading materials—they are more than 10 years old. DS provided language to update the required syllabi language with the most recent EDI statement, religious accommodation policy, Title IX, disclosures of gender-based discrimination, Statement on Confidentiality and Privacy, Title XI Safeguard for Pregnant and Parenting Students, and Emergency Preparedness & Response policies.
 - iii. SRM raised the same concern with the feedback from students in Course Evaluations. SRM asked how NNP planned to incorporate feedback from the course evaluations. There were comments on assignment guidelines

and discussion parameters. In the grading policy, SRM suggested listed the percentage as 5% rather than 05%. The attached Grading Rubric, that was more specific, because they are the same, it is suggested to refine the titles of the columns of this document. The wording for each of the 8 criteria is not the same across documents and refining this would make it clearer. In the Resources for the Elevator Pitch, the YouTube links likely do not need to be included in the syllabus document. Assuming this is frequently updated, they are likely better suited for a more specific assignment page.

- iv. CA commented on the course block for this is listed as M 4:15pm-6:45pm and it should be 4pm-6:45pm. We have to include time for a 15-minute break that's required.

MD moved to table the course, SRM seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously (Maya Begaliev was present to vote on behalf of David Seal).

III. New Business

- a. CA noted we are now attempting to move everything to CIM. The program managers and department chairs have been trained. FR asked the reps to send an email to their department listserv with this notification and copy her and the program managers.
- b. FR updated Erica Valenzuela discussed student feedback at the faculty retreat on concerns about specific courses that have overlap with other courses. Dr. Valenzuela will discuss with each department the concerns of the students. FR advised the CC to be mindful of overlap when reviewing courses.