TULANE UNIVERSITY
Celia Scott Weatherhead School *of*
Public Health & Tropical Medicine

Curriculum Committee Meeting
November 19, 2024
12:00 noon
Zoom:

https://tulane.zoom.us/j/96561472839?pwd=VJXECKwhSsrEpbD3g7Ltyxs5p1UEYw.1

Minutes

Committee Members in Attendance: Dr. Maya Begalieva (MB), CC Chair; Dr. Samuel Kakraba (SK) BIOS Rep; Dr. Stephen Murphy (SM), ENHS Rep: Dr. Aaron Hoffman (AH) EPID Rep; Dr. Arthur Mora (AM) HPAM Rep; Dr. Dominique Meekers (DM) IHSD Rep; Dr. Ken Orie (KO) BSPH Rep: and Dr. Sarah Michaels (SRM) TRMD Rep.

Ex Officio and Advising Attendees:

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

SGA Representatives in Attendance:
Jared Christian, SGA President
Sneha Dev, SGA Secretary

I. **October 18, 2024, Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes**

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

II. **Curriculum Review**

A. **Course Reviews**

    a) **SPHL 7230: Project Management for Public Health** submitted by Lu Yuan as an existing ENHS course (ENHS 7230) to become SPHL 7230) for an initial online offering in Summer 2025 was approved at the October 18, 2024, CC meeting pending revisions for resubmission. **The peer reviewers are Aaron Hoffman and Samuel Kakraba.**
    Reviewer's comments
      i. It wasn't clear which program this course was being aligned to which is the MS in Health Security
      ii. Recommended Learning Objective (L/O) edit would be to change the word "evaluate" to "examine"
      iii. Recommended using the language from the competency mapping the program used for this course as a signature assessment
        1. There are two courses listed for the same competency and it's not clear in the list of assessments which one belongs to this course, and which belongs to the other course (DRLS 6050)
      iv. Recommended clearly stating in the attendance policy which live sessions are required and adding a message to students to contact for an alternative assignment if they are unable to attend a live session

     v. Suggested making a rubric for each assignment rather than having a generic rubric

     vi. Assignments that are referenced for working professionals, it is recommended to provide an alternate hypothetical situation for those who aren't in the same situation – this was revision was made for one assignment but not in another assignment.

     vii. Remove template language from syllabus

AH made motion to approve with minor revisions to be submitted to reviewers for approval. SK seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

    b) **IHSD 6470: Public Health Leadership for Sustainable Development in the Age of Disruption (Sustainable PH Leadership)** submitted by Nancy Mock for initial offering Summer 2025. **The peer reviewers are David Seal and Aaron Hoffman.**
    Reviewer's comments

     i. L/O – "discuss" is levels 2, provided options that were 3 and 4 = made edits as required prior to meeting

     ii. The assessment of learning was embedded in the course structure – this was corrected prior to meeting by separating those out

     iii. The grading rubric was added per request by reviewers

     iv. The instruction hours were corrected from 45 hours to 47

     v. Clarified pre-readings and in course readings

     vi. Recommended incorporating the course schedule in the template for more clarity and connection between daily activities and learning objectives

        1. Identifying the assignments tied to the that day, due dates etc., has been updated

     vii. Rubric #4 – total added up to 110 rather than 100, this has been adjusted to equal 100

     viii. A1 policy was missing from syllabus

     ix. Suggestion to revise attendance policy has been revised

     x. The course description which will match the catalog's description is too long, the description should be 120 words or less. If further explanation is required, please add to a second paragraph.

DS made motion to approve with minor revisions to be submitted to peer reviewers. AH seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

    c) **IHSD 6480: Rwanda: Anatomy of Sustainable Health System** submitted by Jeanine Condo for initial offering Summer 2025. **The peer reviewers are Sarah Michaels and Samuel Kakraba.**
    Reviewer's comments

     i. The L/O did not meet Bloom's taxonomy (e.g., interpret conduct use were being used which were not at the right level) on the syllabus and course review form

     ii. Recommended AI policy was added prior to meeting.

    iii. The Support Material Section of the syllabus 'Biostatistics in Rwanda" was recommended to edit as this statement as it appears to suggest Biostatistics is different for different countries

    iv. Biostats and Epidemiology is stated as needed prerequisites but there weren't any courses specific; suggested to put course name or remove that as a prerequisite. This was updated prior to meeting.

    v. Suggestion to slightly edit L/O #1 & #3; #1 edit was made prior to meeting, #3 consider rephrasing what is being prepared or developed there.

    vi. The 20% participation does not provide much guidance on what is being captured; rubrics/point range help explain the range of fulfilling or not fulfilling of the assessment would be helpful

    vii. Information about ChatGPT was further down the syllabus it was suggested to move it up so that there is a clear AI policy

    viii. Suggested that because work is being done with public health data and protected health information that students should take the CITI Training on Research Ethics and Data Privacy course or some other similar training, this update was added as a prerequisite prior to the meeting.

    ix. Minor edits: range or rubric to describe what is considered complete or incomplete; recommend using rubric to describe how student will be assessed (participation, assignments, final projects)

SRM made motion to approve with minor revisions. SK seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

d) **SBPS 7510: Maternal & Child Health: Life Course Perspective** submitted by Shokufeh Ramirez for review in anticipation of the submission of the Maternal and Child Health (MCH) Area of Specialization. **The peer reviewers are Kenneth Orie and Arthur Mora.**
Reviewer's comments

    i. Recommended to break up the signature assessment to display clearly which assessment is mapped to which competency as it was one for all the competencies

    ii. Attendance policy – the assessment table does not include an attendance as a graded assignment (no grade point allocated in the assessment table reference attendance as an activity) though students are penalized after 2 absences which should be defined with a percentage point if students will get penalized for not attending.

        1. There is 10% of the grade aligned with class participation

        2. AM provided language that could be used

        3. SR will delete sentence specific about deducting points for attendance because according to the participation rubric if they are not there to participate, they will be assessed accordingly

    iii. There was an error in the grading scale that was updated prior to the meeting

KO motioned to approve with minor revisions to submit to reviewers. DM seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

e) **TRMD 6760: From Theory to Practice: Public Health Field Skills in Peru** submitted by Valerie Paz-Soldan for initial offering Summer 2025. **The peer reviewers are Arthur Mora and Stephen Murphy.**
Reviewer's comments
    i. This is an elective course therefore no mapping to competency required
    ii. Review course description to make sure relevant information is included in the course catalog; the 2nd paragraph of the introduction if there is essential information provided here it will not be in the course catalog (e.g., an emersion experience); as the course description is currently 117 words and the max is 120.
        1. The 2nd paragraph can be included in the new syllabus template as additional information
    iii. The course has 8 L/O that covers from levels 2 to a level 6 with 2 instances with verbs that are connected with conjunction (identify and apply; plan and execute).
        1. Recommended to revise L/P to be consistent with 6000-level courses Bloom's Taxonomy guidance
        2. Suggestion is to look at where there are 2 verbs being used and choose the one that is most appropriate to the Bloom's Taxonomy and the intent of the assessment
        3. Bloom's level 5 and 6 – those would be 'assess' perhaps appraise may work instead
        4. Plan is a level 6 – so perhaps 'develop' may be more consistent with our guidance
    iv. This course has a slight overlap with the content in this course and other courses in the school - GIS, Environmental Health Risk, Outbreak, Epidemiology etc.- which are modules within the course that are standalone courses in the school.
        1. SM: this is a distinct learning opportunity, that is an immersion experience which clearly separates the course
    v. Page 4 /the rubric is suggested to be separated out into the regular rubric format (reflect more on what is expected, expand beyond 1 row – more detail is better)
    vi. Suggested to provide description of evaluation for each of the assessment types included under participation

AM made motion to approve with minor revisions. SM seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

B. **Program Reviews**

a) **MS Occupational and Environmental Health Sciences** submitted by Rustin Reed to replace the current MSPH in Industrial Hygiene. The program includes name changes to three courses (ENHS 6620, ENHS 7110, ENHS 7500) and one new course with an initial offering in Fall 2025 (ENHS 6970) was tabled at the October 18, 2024, CC mtg to review updated syllabi at the next CC mtg. **The peer reviewers are Sarah Michaels and David Seal.**
Reviewer's comments

i. Graduation requirements should be specified with completion of 45 credits – this edit was made prior to meeting
ii. Recommended to include course numbers in the competency table
iii. There should be exact correspondence between the competencies listed in the program review and the competencies listed in the syllabus learning objectives for the designated courses.
iv. If they are the essential class to the program competency, please ensure the exact competency is parallel in the syllabus; edit the language that's already there
    1. *see:* ENHS 6970 Exposure Assessment does not list the competency in the program review
    2. *see*: ENHS 7620 Health Risk Assessment does not list the competency in the program review
v. The listing of assignments in the Program Review is hard to disentangle
    1. Suggested to number each assessment activity and describe the relation to the competency (this would allow for easier comparison to clearly evaluate their concordance)
vi. Some assignments do not seem to be acceptable signature assessments (e.g. regular discussions) – only the primary assessments that are graded should be listed.
    1. Unless they are listed and numbered with a description noting the ones that are fulfilling for that class, that program competency would provide more clarity
vii. The thesis should cover all the competencies but for accreditation purposes, a thesis must map to didactics only and not competency mapping
viii. Recommended to describe what the thesis is or includes, a rubric for it, and how the thesis will get assessed if RR will assess it
ix. The model schedule doesn't summarize the total credits
x. RR questioned if there is a model of the matrix that map competencies with assignments etc. to provide guidance on what is expected.
    1. CMA advised RR to contact Avery Peterson (Accreditation/Evaluation Specialist in the Department of Academic Affairs)
xi. RR stated the program's name won't be changing quite as much but they were asked to include something to clarify for those who don't know what Industrial Hygiene is
    1. Recently a degree was sunset (Occupational and Environmental Science)
    2. Therefore, starting this degree as Occupational and Environmental Health Sciences (adding an "S") can complicate record keeping – the program name needs to be differentiated
    3. Name change can be submitted with program amendment form

    xii. Under Graduation Requirements thesis is listed; on the 2nd bullet point there's a mention "completion of all SPHTM foundational courses" – seems to be a cut/paste error (pg. 6, #5) – Remove

DS made motion to approve with minor revisions. SRM seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

    b) MS Biostatistics and Data Science submitted by Jian Li/Sudesh Srivastev for review of the restructured program **The peer reviewers are Dominique Meekers and Kenneth Orie**
    Reviewer's comments
      i. Competency and course assessment matrix: page 5, the 3rd competency there are 6 courses listed and 3 of those are selective DM wasn't sure if selectives could be listed as a requirement since everyone may not take all 3 courses.
        1. CMA confirmed you can have selectives, but you don't map a competency to them; or if you are going to map a competency to the selective then every selective option has to be addressing that competency
      ii. JL stated the 3 electives is not selective courses they are set as optional for program requirements; 6 courses are being required at the end of that there are 2 courses needed as required courses, but these 2 courses can be taken out of 3 courses so that would mean 2 out of 3.
        1. There is not a fixed requirement here; whichever 2 the students feel, and the advisor feel is appropriate
        2. This is why they are listed for the competency mapping
        3. CMA advised this is referred to as a selective (instead of an elective)
        4. JL: the 3rd competency is mapped to all 3 courses (BIOS 7220, 7250, 7400)
      iii. Page 10 – before Section B, there's a reference to Comprehensive Exam which is likely from an older version – please remove this bullet
      iv. Page 11 – Section C there is an alignment with the MS and CHS which is also likely from an older version – please remove this bullet

DM approved with minor revisions. KO seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

  C. Area of Specialization
    a) Infectious Disease Epidemiology submitted by Ronald Blanton and Patricia Kissinger for initial offering Fall 2026. **The peer reviewers are Stephen Murphy and Dominique Meekers.**
    Reviewer's comments
      i. Documentation on the form needs more information/elaboration for CEPH; the form needs to be in sync with the syllabi
        1. The area where competencies are listed there's the signature assessment currently the course is listed- it is recommended to

provide a description of what the assignment is from each of those courses

2. Not just the exam but more specific that describes how you're going to measure those competencies

ii. The submitted syllabi –the competency mapping table is needed with a description of those signature

1. Once the courses are switched to new syllabus template this should help with signature assessment

2. the competencies are measured by the signature assessment please describe in 1-3 sentences with how this is being addressed

iii. The form list faculty members and their credentials which is very brief.

1. It is recommended for CEPH to write 3-4 lines explaining what their background is not just the courses they teach

iv. AOS does require competency map the way CEPH functions with reporting is they will view an AOS the same as they review a degree program.

v. Description – proposal indicated bacterial biology and there was no mention of viral pathogens (intentional omission or an oversight?)

vi. Bloom's is a bit off with TRMD syllabus for Methods and Systems for Infectious Disease Surveillance Infectious Disease Surveillance this course/syllabus needs to be added to the December CC meeting agenda

vii. CA recommended seeing this AOS offered both online and residential

DM made a motion to table until all courses are submitted and approved in addition to other recommended edits. SM seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

D. **Other Business**
   a) **Reviewer's Process**
      i. Proposal to do course/program review and bring the full review to the scheduled CC meeting
         1. After CC meeting send the changes to be made or questions to be addressed to the instructor
         2. Then the CC can decide depending on the scope of requested edits/changes if the course/program has to go back under full review of the committee or to the initial reviewers
      ii. Initial reviews: 2 weeks
      iii. After the meeting deadline for submitters to submit their changes: 2 weeks
      iv. Reviewers deadline to respond to submitters revisions: 2 weeks