



## Curriculum Committee Meeting

May 14, 2024

10:0 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Zoom:

<https://tulane.zoom.us/j/95434937094?pwd=ck9PLo42MVVpSodkUWZFNlh4bzZLUTo9>

### 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. Dominique Meekers (DM), IHSD Rep; Dr. Sarah Michaels (SRM), TRMD Rep; Dr. Arthur Mora (AM) HPAM Rep, Dr. David Seal, SBPS Rep

**Ex Officio and Advising Attendees:**

Dr. Christine Arcari (CA), Sr. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

**SGA Representatives in Attendance:**

**I. April 16, 2024, Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes**

- i. SM made a motion to approve, YZ seconded the motion. Motion carried by majority quorum.

**II. Curriculum Review**

**A. Course Reviews**

**a) ENHS 6970 Exposure Assessment** submitted by Rustin Reed for initial offering in Fall 2025. This course was tabled at the March CC meeting. The peer reviewers are **Aruthur Mora** (on behalf of Mark Diana) and **Dominique Meekers**.

**i. DM's comments:**

1. Page 3 of the syllabus states, "students are expected to attend every live session" then states, "sessions will be recorded for future listening and for those unable to attend live" This gives the impression that they're not all required.
2. It is the understanding that only 1/3 of the live sessions can be required. Specify on the class schedule that the live session is required.
3. Suggests that all live sessions not be required but recommended.

**ii. CA's comments:**

1. The attendance policy listed is not for an online modality.
2. If a student cannot attend a certain live session, an offer to the student of a different assignment to make up the points.
3. Up to 1/3 of the live sessions can be required if there is graded component that is happening during that live session.
4. Required live sessions must be stated on the syllabus under the attendance policy "Dates (**input specific dates**) are required live sessions."



iii. **AM's comments:**

1. Will provide RR with the attendance policy options 1 & 2 for him to choose from to apply to the syllabus. If Q & A are part of grading, there should be an alternative for student's who cannot make a class.

iv. **FR's comments:**

1. SPHL 6050 as a pre-requisite remove minimum of grade C, attach a rubric, have attendance to A or B; also note on the syllabus that the oral presentation is a required live session.

**AM made a motion to approve with minor revisions, DM seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

**b) SBPS 6340 Introduction to Monitoring & Evaluation of Health Programs (online & residential)** submitted by Francoise Grossmann (residential) and Megan Weemer (online). The peer reviewers are **Yaozhong Liu and Aaron Hoffman.**

i. **YZ's comments:**

1. The course (online & residential) both look fine and have no further comments.

ii. **AH's comments:**

1. Minor edits to add words to make sure the two versions are the same.
2. The updated L/O table where the competencies are first making it kind of difficult to tell what goes with what, which assignments are meant to match with which objectives.
3. Questioned, if it would make sense to have the activities adjacent to the competencies they are addressing – for accounting purposes, especially if the activities are related to the objectives but not necessarily addressing them, but specifically they are meant to address the competencies and how their being fulfilled.

iii. **CA's comments:**

1. The activities match with the competency not with the objectives. A course needs as many signature assessments to meet the competency.
2. If a course reference a competency it will need to show the activity to address the competency in each course. Course objectives first then the competency map.
3. The competencies are what a student needs to have at the end of the degree program. The learning objectives are happening in the course that supports the competencies. Then, the assessments is how the competencies are being assessed.
4. We have a large competency mapping we know which courses want to map to the competencies. If this competency is mapped to this course, we must show we're assessing this competency in the course, it may also be mapped to another course, and we're going to show that as well.



5. The learning objectives will be listed separately and then the competency map. Thus, the students will see the course learning objectives first and then the competency map showing how the program learning objectives and the course learning objectives map into the signature assessments.
  6. Competency maps must be updated every semester.
- iv. **FR's comments:**
1. Everything is driven by the competency. The learning objectives are the course learning objectives.
  2. The MPH competencies, the course learning objectives and the signature activities addressing the competencies could be made clear in the table headings if necessary.
  3. MPH competencies and signature activities that support that competency will be in one table.
  4. The grading scale should be: A, A-, B, B-, C and F.
  5. Under the course description the last line should state, "they're developing a monitoring and evaluation plan?"
    - a. FG's comments:
- v. **DS's comments:**
1. The course that has the signature activity will have the exact wording used in the AOS map.
- vi. **DM's comments:**
1. There is inconsistency with the title and the course description and the content that follows in terms of that. The title refers to "monitoring evaluation" and so does the first part of the course description, then it only discusses evaluation.
    - a. **FG's comments:** the monitoring part of the course is something that is discussed in class is part of process evaluation.
  2. There is confusion with impact evaluation, if you have monitoring and evaluation, it would be assumed it includes impact evaluation. Pointed out, the first line of the course description says, "introduction to monitoring and evaluation" and the last line says "develop an evaluation plan" with no mention of monitoring. This alludes to 'impact evaluation.'
  3. Recommends: clarification about the terminology would be helpful or specify that they're process evaluation, which aligns more with monitoring. The course title is monitoring and evaluation.
    - a. FG's comments: the course includes both process evaluation and outcome evaluation. Process evaluation being the evaluation of the implementation of the course. Will inform/teach students what is considered as monitoring in the class; monitoring could also be monitoring outcomes.
  4. Wherever it says evaluation plan, it will become monitoring and evaluation plan.



**AH made a motion to approve with minor changes, YZ seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

- c) SBPS 6690: Essentials of Public Health Nutrition** submitted by Keelia O'Malley is a required course of the MSPH Nutrition Program for an initial offering in Fall 2024. The peer reviewers are Stephen Murphy and Arthur Mora.
- i. **SM's comments:**
    1. Recommended minor grammar suggestions to the learning objectives table has been updated. This is a replacement due to the departmental name change (GCHB) that was provided in the same 6690 number is going away because there is no longer GCHB.
  - ii. **AM's comments:**
    1. Recalled comments regarding the learning objectives and suggested to change the word "communicate" to "examine".

**AM made a motion to approve, SM seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

- d) SPHL 8100: Health Equity and Advocacy** submitted by Jylana Sheats for initial offering of Fall 2024. This course is a required elective for the DrPH program. The peer reviewers are **Dominique Meekers and Stephen Murphy**
- i. **SM's comments:**
    1. Minor track changes were provided for ordering/numerical tracking issues with the table format.
  - ii. **CA's comments:**
    1. This is a required course for the DrPH program, but other students can take it as an elective.
    2. Clarify the number of assignments under assessment of learning and rating policy.
    3. Confirmed, no pre-requisite is required its standalone.
  - iii. **FR's comments:**
    1. Acknowledge the step 2 form's indication that this is an advanced required course and properly listed with no pre-requisites – wanting to ensure that this is how the department intended it to be.
  - iv. **DM's comments:**
    1. Recommended to state that the course is in term 1 being an 8-week course.
    2. Table of Learning Objectives (L/O) the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) objective the appropriate term should be "determine or recommend."
    3. L/O 5 & 6 reducing to one very would be better.
    4. L/O #5: consider saying "prioritize primary and secondary data."
    5. L/O #7: use, "synthesize multiple data etc."
    6. Grading Policy: terminology is a slightly confusing, project assignment is listed and then other assignments; Recommendation is to rephrase this.



7. Additional recommendations: for the line item that has assignment and discussion, replace assignments with implicit bias essay and then list separately. This will make things clearer and there's no confusion between what the different assignments are.
8. Provide a rubric for assignment #3.
9. Page 7 -Change the tile to project video presentation this change will make students aware from the beginning this is a video presentation.
  - a. Ensure the points match for the assignments with the table.
10. Suggestion: show the points in either the table or L/O to be consistent.

**SM made a motion to approve with minor revisions, YZ seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**

**e) SPHU 2500: Principles of Professionalism Healthcare** submitted by Joe Keating for initial offering for Spring 2025. The course was tabled at the April CC meeting. The peer reviewers are **Sarah Michaels and Aaron Hoffman**.

**i. AM's comments:**

1. SPHU 2500 must be approved before the program, but the program competencies were never approved. Thus, CC had concerns with the competencies. Worked with CA to develop competencies that will have to be approved at a later date but at least 2 have been inserted into the syllabus.
2. **CA/AM** feel comfortable with the competencies to approve the course as is with the competencies listed that will reflect the final version of the competencies for the program.
  - a. If there's a change in the competencies, then the competencies in the course would have to be updated with the program.

**ii. SRM's comments:**

1. Recommends – minor edit (the page header is missing)
2. The rubric's lowest rating is very high, there isn't a spread of points across the rubric. This doesn't have to be changed just making a reference.
3. Make sure the course title remains consistent across all forms.

**iii. AH's comments:**

1. Most of the comments/recommendations provided previously have been addressed, just minor typos.
2. The comment regarding assessing attendance has been updated (excused absence – the word **excused** was removed).

**SRM made a motion to approve, AH seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.**



**f.) TRMD 7350: Disease Control in Low Resource Setting** submitted by Latha Rajan and Maggie Silio for course review applying for change to TRMD 7350 (new number/name). The peer reviewers are **Arthur Mora and Yaozhong Liu.**

**i. LR's comments:**

1. Combining two courses TRMD 6350 – Existing Disease, Prevention and Control which is 2-credits with TRMD 7000, a 1-credit hour seminar, to create the 3-credit hour, TRMD 7350.
2. There is no pre-requisites because the coursework is practical not theoretical.
3. Proposing name change, as the current name is Disease Prevention and Control in Developing Countries is a term that is outdated therefore, naming it, Disease Control in Low Resource Setting.

**ii. FR's comments:**

1. With the course changing from a 6000-level course to a 7000-level course the learning objectives must change with TRMD 6350 Disease Prevention and Control in Developing Countries, 2-credit hour will go away.
2. Has concerns that the course doesn't look like a 7000-level course how it is presented.
3. Recommends: Place in the course description that students are analyzing an outbreak, etc.
4. Cannot build on knowledge if there are no prerequisites. If the intention is to show the progression of knowledge through a program, the course should have a prerequisite for foundational knowledge. If it is not intended to be this way and a 7000-level course that anyone can take, then a pre-requisite is not needed.
5. Recommended to consider that so much of the course is not student presentations but active learning, which was suggested by one of the reviewers.
6. Recommended: Make the assignments clear (journal presentation *vs* individual presentation *vs* student presentation) consistent with what is listed in the grading.

**iii. CA's comments:**

1. We will keep TRMD 7000 on the books in the event it is needed for another purpose, renumber 6350 to 7350, and change the credit hour.
2. Clearly defining in the course description, a 7000-level course is wanted.

**iv. AM's comments:**

1. Made suggestions to increase the level of taxonomy verbs in the Learning Objectives (L/O) – illustrate, examine; made revisions to assess, evaluate, examine and critique.
2. Referenced (1) illustrate was changed to assess; (2) examine was changed to evaluate and examine, and (4) illustrate was changed to critique. *Mastering of analyzing* and critiquing published peer-reviewed hypothesis-based studies.



3. Now, matches the signature activity because those verbs were the verbs used in the signature activity but not in the objectives.

**v. YZ's comments:**

1. Explain more about the 3 different types of presentations.
2. Provide the due date for the 3 written assignments and the dates for quizzes/exams.
3. Recommends: If possible, to add more didactic content with specific topics into the course syllabus

**FR suggested to table the course and not vote down. This is more of a language component going to a 7000-level course and moving from 2-credit hour to 3-credit hour.**

**g.) TRMD 7900: Antimicrobial Resistance** submitted by Ronald Blanton which will be part of a proposed Certificate in Infectious Disease in Epidemiology and an elective in the MPHTM and MS in Tropical Medicine program for an initial offering in Spring 2025. The peer reviewers are **Dominique Meekers and Aaron Hoffman.**

**i. DM's comments:**

1. Questioned, if this course should be a 6000-level? The pre-requisite its targeted towards masters.
2. Reviewing the L/O it presents as it could possibly be a 6000-level, though there are no strong opinions about it, just making a reference.
3. In Materials, Readings, and Resources, the description of the reading (pg. 3) states in part, "current journal articles accessible through the library databases etc." gives the indication that there are additional required readings that are not specified and should be listed in the class schedule if they are required readings.
4. Suggests: if there are required readings, they should be specified in the syllabus and listed in the class schedule unless they are optional readings.

**ii. RB's comments:**

1. The intention is to use the articles that have stated knowledge.
2. In terms of the 6000-level, it was aimed that those that are not only our students but hoping to bring in a certificate in epidemiology, molecular epidemiology, and infectious diseases specialists as well.

**iii. AH's comments:**

1. The verbs used points to a 6000-level course recommends revising to 7000-level verbs.

**iv. FR's comments:**

1. If this is to be a 7000-level course, it seems appropriate to revisit the verbs in the L/Os.
2. For Learning Objective #1, refer to Bloom's Taxonomy so that the course will look more advanced.

**v. CA's comments:**





1. L/O #1 needs to be redone. However, the verbs for L/O #2 and #3 are okay.
2. If it's not a required course, there's no competency map.

**DM made a motion to approve with minor changes in L/O #1 & #2, AH seconded the motion. Motion was carried unanimously.**

### **B. Program Review**

**b) MPH in Epidemiology** submitted by Jeanette Gustat for Fall 2025 initial offering was tabled at the April CC meeting. The peer reviewers are **Sarah Michaels and David Seal.**

**i. JG's comments:**

1. The peer reviewers suggested changes were implemented.
2. The competencies were revised. There are now 5 from the 4 previously used suggestion.
3. Updated outcomes learning assessment plan to make edits.

**SM made a motion to approve with the 5/6/24 version in Box with the 5 competencies not 6, DS seconded the motion. Motion was carried unanimously.**

### **C. Area of Specialization Review**

**a) Health Education and Communications (HEDC) – Area of Specialization** was submitted by David Seal as a new 12 credit Area of Specialization (AOS) for residential graduate students. The peer reviewers are **Yaohong Liu and Stephen Murphy.**

**i. DS's comments:**

1. This is a new 12-credit area of specialization for residential graduate students who want to complete an area of specialization in Health Education and Communication, at least in SBPS.
2. SBPS students are required to take social determinants as a degree requirement. They would have the 5 courses that they need to be eligible for the community health education specialist certificate exam.
3. Students outside of SBPS who haven't taken a social determinant class must take one to be eligible for the exam.
  - a. They would still get the specialization if they weren't interested in the exam without taking the social determinant class.
4. Submitted the cover letter, the 4 required courses for the AOS, the competency map to show how the 4 courses map into the AOS competencies, and the 8 areas that are covered in the community health education specialist exam.
  - a. Includes classes outside of the AOS because they're foundational courses that address the exam, and all students would have had them.
5. The syllabi were changed to ensure that the learning objectives and competency wording met the AOS competency.





6. Also, to ensure the wording is identical in the syllabus and the competency map for the AOS, note that one course (6340) had more significant changes to bring into alignment for both the residential and online modalities.
  7. The certificate needs to be updated. The only difference is that it is 15 credits and will require the social determinants course in terms of the specialization they need for the exam.
  8. Students outside of SBPS will need to take additional classes/electives to be eligible for the exam.
- ii. **SM's comments:**
1. Most of the prior comments/suggestions have been addressed.
- iii. **FR's comments:**
1. Of the 4 courses, the first 3 courses (7000-level) have minor revisions to make sure the competency etc. are all in line, and the 4<sup>th</sup> course (6340) has more revisions and why the course is being reviewed today?
  2. How are the certificates and AOS going to be related to each other?
  3. The committee will review it as a standalone.
  4. Questioned if the competencies listed in the 1<sup>st</sup> column were specific to the specialization; AOS have their own competencies. (affirmative)
- iv. **CA's comments:**
1. The certificates are for students that are not in a degree seeking program at TU SPHTM.
  2. In an AOS if the core courses have any prerequisites that are one of the 5 required prerequisites there not listed as part of the AOS.
  3. In a certificate we need to put those courses into the certificate. The same AOS might be 12 credit hours, but it may be a 15 or 18 credit hour certificate because it's adding in those prerequisites that are not needed to add into the AOS.
  4. The specialization will stay at 12credit hours.
  5. This was an MPH that is going to sunset, basically we're taking the competencies and the courses that were in the MPH and putting them into this.

**AH made a motion to approve with minor changes, YZ seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **D. Other Business**

##### **a) HPAM 8310: Theory in Analysis of Public Health Policy and Management**

###### **i. AM's comments**

1. Found this doctoral level course that was using old competencies, updates should have been made.
2. Questioned if this is something for the CC to be informed of/reviewed?



ii. **CA's comments**

1. This is a minor administrative form that doesn't go through the CC but to FR for signature.

**Meeting Adjourned.**