

Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine

Curriculum Committee Meeting- In Person-Room 2414

October 11, 2021

1:00pm- 3:00pm

Faculty: <https://tulane.zoom.us/j/93402338561>

Call-In +1 312 626 6799

**Minutes**

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Dr. Felicia Rabito (FR), Faculty Chair  
Dr. Amanda Anderson (AA), EPID Rep  
Dr. Assafa Abdelghani (AG), ENHS, Rep  
Dr. Maya Begaliev (MB), GCHB Rep  
Dr. Yaozhong Liu (YZ), BIOS Rep  
Dr. Charles Stoecker (CS), HPM Rep  
Dr. Latha Rajan (LR), TRMD Rep  
Dr. Dominique Meekers (DM), IHSD Rep

**Other Faculty in Attendance:**

Dr. Lindsey Ho  
Dr. Julie Hernandez  
Dr. Anastasia Gage  
Dr. Paul Hutchinson  
Dr. Ilana Scherl  
Dr. Mark Dal Corso

**Ex Officio and Advising Attendees:**

Dr. Christine Arcari (CA), Sr. Associate Dean  
Dr. Angela Breckenridge (AB), Curr. Dev & Assessment  
Dr. Alicia Battle (DB), Associate Dean for Online Programs  
Dr. Katherine Andrinopoulos (KA), Director of Doctoral Programs  
Susan Cantrell, Enrollment Manager (SC)

- I. **August 9, 2021, Revised Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes- Motion by LR, seconded by AG. Motion carried by majority quorum. (CS was not present for this vote.)**
  
- II. **Curriculum Course Reviews**
  - A. Foundational Courses:
    1. **SPHL 6050- Biostatistics for Public Health Practices (Faculty, Lindsey Ho, Peer Reviewers- CC) submitted for standard course review. (Tabled from June CC meeting) TBD--See Old Business**
  
  - B. Course Review
    1. **IHSD 8200-Sustainable Human Development: Theory and practice (Faculty, Julie Hernandez, and Dauphine Sloan- not present for meeting, Peer Reviewers- Charles Stoecker and Latha Rajan) IHSD 8200 was submitted for initial offering—Fall 2022. CS commented the course seemed unique but had a few minor comments concerning learning objectives. CS added the learning objectives seemed like compound objectives and suggested removing some**

verbs and make sure they are singular and easy to test. He added the normal level of detail with the signature assessment were not present and should be added to test the learning objectives. All learning objectives have two signature assessments, but typically only one is requested. CS suggested changing the word “midterm” to “final”. CS added the calendar at the end of the syllabus, did not show when each learning objective come into the class activities. CS suggested adding another column to the calendar table with the learning objectives addressed in that class section. In addition, the exams are not listed on the calendar table and there are no rubrics for the response papers but since this is an initial offering, he would request the rubrics are submitted for the final review.

LR suggested to add “Dr” and “PhD” for listed faculty of record on page one of the syllabi. LR noted the course description is different in the course review and syllabus and should be the same. LR agreed with CS concerning the details in learning objective table. LR also noticed in learning objectives table, Dr. Hernandez has six competencies listed but there are only five program competencies; The second competency listed is not accurate. In addition, where the exams are described, “Second exam” should be changed to “Final exam”. LR commented the grading scale “C” grade percentage is wide and the “B-” grade percentage is very narrow. LR agreed with CS about the last learning objectives column. On the course review form the course abbreviation should be “IHSD” not “SHD” and there should be more wording in the title (ex: Sustainable Human Development: Theory and Practice). On page 3, (number 4) the level of academic rigor, nothing is selected for this area. FR asked if the CC had any questions. DM asked the CC if the description of the course in the syllabus why the description can’t be more elaborate. FR agreed.

FR added on the syllabus the description can be what the faculty decides if it is consistent with the course review form. CA added there will be a new system added through Course leaf--Canvas Course Information Management System (CIM). It is an electronic system that will manage the course reviews and automatically populate the information in the course catalog. Dr. Hernandez requested LR comments to be emailed to her. FR added if Dr. Hernandez to add a rubric for the paper; adding that students seem to like it and the professor seems more objective in their grading. Dr. Hernandez confirmed she would create and send the rubric for the next review. FR asked Dr. Arcari about the signature assessments the LR and CS mentioned. FR commented based on their reviews the signature assessments are written incorrectly in Dr. Hernandez’s course review. FR read the signature assessments from the course review to CA, confirming there was confusion based around the number of signature assessments and whether the assessments are detailed enough. CA commented that she would like to think deeper on this.

However, from CA's perspective the assessments are fine as-is for the syllabus and the course review. But in terms of accreditation, we need to make sure that we don't have every competency mapped to a midterm or a final. There is no rubric required for exams, so that is appropriate. CA added, for an overall review of the program and mapping the competencies to all the courses in the plan of study, there should be an assessment that has the detail that is required. FR asked if the Step 2 form is sufficient adding that Dr. Hernandez has three of the five learning objectives and the signature assessment just says "midterm" and "final". FR asked for AB's input. AB added that this objectives/assessment/competency table in the course review form is used to populate the competency map. We take what's in there and transfer it from the program's reviews' competency map. That way, the assessments are already described, and we don't have to rethink it again on the course review. If it's a standalone elective that's not mapped to program competencies, there may be an argument for keeping it simply "midterm" and "Final" for the assessments. But it's not important for student to understand how they achieve the learning objectives, so it's good to have the explanation on the form as well as on the syllabus, regardless of the type of course. Is that, ok? CA added maybe we could pull the competencies that have more in-depth explanation of the assessment, and those are become the competencies that should be mapped to the course instead of all 5 competencies; some are not necessary.

FR commented to Dr. Hernandez and Dr. Meekers that the course can be approved but when the signature activities are resubmitted that the CC would appreciate input from CA. When reviewing all courses, you can decide whether to list 5 learning objectives and all competencies. DM noted that's when looking at the program review, it has nothing to do with what we have here. CA added that one course doesn't need to be mapped to every program competency. It's got to be "who's got the best assessment for the competency" and that's the one that should be kept. FR commented to CA, that the CC would appreciate clarity on the nature of signature assignments in order to meet expectations of CEPH and her office. CA commented, for the program, they're going to look at the signature or program level and see that this is happening, look in the syllabus and make sure they're there. We claim that and say where the signature assessments are, because then I've got to pick up a random course and start looking for these different assessments. The other thing is, this whole competency mapping is that people like to think of heat maps and showing this improvement over time. CA added this works best for medical schools and the way their exams are structured, but does not work for the way our courses and exams are structured.

FR asked Dr. Hernandez if the explanation was clear? Dr. Hernandez requested to share the notes from the curriculum committee. FR agreed. LR added she thought the 8000-level courses have prerequisites but there are no prerequisites listed. JH mentioned it is important for all students given that

sustainability is in the department name. FR suggested considering if it should be a 7000-level course and requiring it for doctoral students. Dr. Hernandez added it can be discussed and considered with Dr. Hutchinson. LR added the IHSD program review requires students to take the foundational courses. Dr. Hutchinson commented the pre-req is a master's degree and the student is entering the doctoral program. The only requirement should be foundational courses. DM added the 7000-level course makes more sense for this course. Changes to this course review include changing the course level to 7000-level, suggested rubric, and fixing the learning objective competencies. **LR motioned to approve with revisions. CS seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

**2. SBPS 7280- Qualitative Methods I: Basic Foundations (Faculty, David Seal- not present for meeting, Peer Reviewers- Charles Stoecker and Latha Rajan) SPBS 7280 was submitted for standard course review—Fall 2022. (Tabled from August CC meeting)** LR commented the course title was more than 30 characters and did not comply with Banner, this change was updated. LR asked if this was a doctoral course level and Dr. Seal provided an explanation that most of the students have masters. LR asked for clarity on the contact hours and Dr. Seal provided an explanation. All suggested revisions were updated and submitted by Dr. Seal. CS added there were some details requested to be added to the signature assignments that Dr. Seal revised. **LR motioned to approve. CS seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

**3. SBPS 8700- Maternal and Child Health Advanced Methods Seminar (Faculty, Maeve Wallace- not present for meeting, Peer Reviewers- Amanda Anderson and Yaozhong Liu) SBPS 8700 was submitted for initial course offering—Fall 2022.** AA mentioned the title was updated. The most important feedback was there was no overlap in the original version that was submitted with any existing courses. AA did a side-by-side comparison and found there were substantial overlap in the learning objectives compared to EPID-6480 and to a lesser extent with EPID-7000. AA asked Dr. Wallace to identify the new learning objectives and how they fill in gaps. Dr. Wallace updated the learning objectives quite substantially. Second, there were a very broad range of topics for introductory about maternal child health outcomes to very advanced methods and how analytical techniques can be used for analyzing data in this area.

AA suggested to Dr. Wallace that it may be challenging for masters' students without any relevant prerequisites to follow everything that start very basic then leads to very advanced. Dr. Wallace agreed and made revisions. AA suggested the title change considering it may be confusing to students. AA added the course does not have any prerequisites. LR asked if this was course. AA responded it is an elective for the PhD work. AA added there were discrepancies whether it was weekly or biweekly meetings, that has been updated to clarify its weekly; also, which students was the course intended for, it's been confirmed the course was designed for doctoral students. AA

added there also discrepancies with the learning objectives wording and this was revised.

YZ added the learning objectives were the only concern, but this was revised and updated. FR asked if there were additional comments from anyone. FR commented she was concerned about the course being at the 8000-level as a seminar and the prerequisites. FR was not sure if this was the definition of the 8000-level course. AG added he does not believe the 8000-level is appropriate for such a course. Dr. Andrinopoulos commented she believes there is material that is more directed towards doctoral learning, and this also applies to IHSD 8200.

Dr. Andrinopoulos added the idea that there should be a step progression towards material that is appropriate for doctoral curriculum. Dr.

Andrinopoulos gave the example of the pedagogy course that is required for doctoral students because it is important to doctoral training. The pedagogy course isn't a requirement for master's students. Dr. Andrinopoulos explained there needs to be a step progression to have a course this specific to a niche area for people who does research for a living; there can also be other kind of content area courses that you need as a researcher or as an academic, but you may not need to have Pedagogy 1,2, or 3. If it's a theory course, to apply theoretical perspective to how you design research studies, should one have intro theory and then advanced theory for this? If there is unique content that is specific to doctoral training and training as a researcher and an academician that doesn't necessarily need to have this step progression and that might be the reason why this course would be considered at the doctoral level.

FR agreed, adding that there are certain courses that are developed for doctoral students, and you want them to be populated by the doctoral students. FR's concern was whether the course should be given the 8000-level, if it isn't the rigor that 8000 indicates; the "target audience" as listed on the form should determine who should be in the course, not the 8000-level. CA added this topic needs to be discussed more in depth. Adding that if this was discussed with campus, campus would say 6000-level courses are masters courses; 7000 and 8000-level courses are doctoral courses. According to SACS and CEPH accreditation we need to show the students are taking advanced doctoral courses, which are 7000 and 8000-level courses. Masters' students can take doctoral courses, the other thing to review is whether the course is required in the master's program.

If it is a 7000-level course that is required in the master's program, that course should not be considered an advanced doctoral level course. In the doctoral program, we should see at least 18 credit hours of advanced level courses. An advanced research methods course sounds like an 8000-level course. CA recommended having an in-depth discussion would be helpful to make a final decision on this. **AA motioned to approve. YZ seconded. Motion carried by majority quorum. (CS was not present for this vote.)**

- 4. IHSD 7140- Monitoring and Evaluation of HIV/AIDs Program (Faculty, Anastasia Gage, Peer Reviewers- Assafa Abdelghani and Amanda Anderson) IHSD 7140 was submitted for standard course review—Fall 2021.** AG complimented the course as well-organized, and evaluations are excellent. AG commented, upon reviewing, the course had five objectives in #4 and 4 objectives under #5 (which were correct), this was revised. In addition, there were 9 modules, but the dates and times for each module were not listed to meet the required meeting times for a 3-credit hour course, totaling 45 hours; the dates and times were added for each module. AG added there were no prerequisites mentioned for the 7000-level course. All concerns were addressed by Dr. Gage. AA added it seems like a well-organized and received course based on evaluations. AA agreed with AG’s review and suggested to reduce the number of course objectives on the syllabus to 4 total and to update that in the class schedule table at the bottom of the document. All of AA’s concerns were addressed, revised, and submitted by Dr. Gage. FR asked if AA had any questions regarding AG’s comments about prerequisites. AA added she would like to get Dr. Gage’s thoughts about the prerequisites. Dr. Gage added the prerequisites were removed from the program when the course changed to IHSD but will add them in. **AG motioned to approve with minor revisions. AA seconded. Motion carried unanimously.** AB asked if the term of offering should be changed to FA 2022 instead of FA 2021, Dr. Gage replied the course is currently being offered.
- 5. IHSD 8250- Advance Research Methods in Global Health (Faculty, Paul L. Hutchinson, Peer Reviewers- Yaozhong Liu and Maya Begalieva) IHSD 8250 was submitted for standard course review—Spring 2022.** MB commented this is a well-established course at the PhD level and students love it. The concerns included signature assessments, but Dr. Hutchinson addressed those concerns and submitted revised materials. YZ added his only concerns were the grading scale. YZ suggested changing the grading scale from the traditional A-F to add minus grades (i.e., A-, B-, C-, etc.) **MB motioned to approve. YZ seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**
- 6. IHSD 6860- Public Health in Cuba (Faculty, Arachu Castro- not present for meeting, Peer Reviewers- Maya Begalieva and Assafa Abdelghani) IHSD 6860 was submitted for standard course review—Summer 2022.** AG added he encourages faculty to teach courses overseas the experience is great for the students to see what is going on outside the school. AG added the student evals are outstanding and the students are enjoying the experience in Cuba. AG’s concerns included site visits and the types of lectures given by the host which meet the learning objectives of the course. AG added the qualifications, including rank, positions, and titles of the Cuban staff who are contributing to the course should be mentioned. Avery asked Fr if she wanted the reply from

Dr. Castro read in the CC meeting. FR replied we can review this after and add to the minutes.

*Dr. Castro replied via email to AG, "The Cuban faculty varies from year to year. Some are professors at the National School of Public Health or the Institute of Tropical Medicine, and some are directors of health facilities, such as community based-mental health or diabetes center, or managers of daycare centers for the elderly. I could add to the syllabus if you find it pertinent."*

MB commented she suggested limiting "signature assessment" to a single signature assessment in the learning objective table. For the signature assessment, the accreditors want to see a sentence after the name of the single assessment to tie it back to the learning objective. All the assessments needed more words on the initial submission. All suggestions were received, the course review and syllabus were revised and resubmitted. DM added the this is a summer course in Cuba. Dr. Castro will not know the actual schedule, the host or organizational information until May. DM asked where to add this information. AG added Dr. Castro should have an idea of this. DM added if Dr. Castro does this now, chances are it can change by May. FR added this should be updated, although it may change, so the students know they are meeting with a reputable source. **AG motioned to approve with minor revisions, MB seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

- 7. SBPS 7220- Community Organization: Community Work for Social Injustice (Faculty, Ilana Scherl, Peer Reviewers- Dominique Meekers and Charles Stoecker) SBPS 7220 was submitted standard course review—Fall 2021.** DM commented this was a well-organized course and it had a practical component to it that he liked. DM's minor comments included Dr. Scherl did not specify whether it was required or elective course, it was updated that it is an elective course. There was inconsistency with how grading was recorded but that has been updated. FR noted the course review form states it is a program requirement. DM confirmed, it is a program requirement for Health Education, and permission is required from the instructor. DM added, initially one of the learning objectives, number 3, in the signature activity it was listed as class participation, but DM suggested this was not an easy way to document this. The instructor has changed this to the "final paper". DM requested a rubric for the paper and to map the learning objective with the class schedule. The objective of each class is listed so adding a column to the table would be helpful. CS added the mapping of the course calendar to the learning objective suggesting adding another column to the table, agreeing with DM. **DM motioned to approve with revisions, CS seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**
  
- 8. SBPS 6800- Community Training Methodologies (Faculty, Mark Dal Corso, Peer Reviewers- Latha Rajan and Assafa Abdelghani) SBPS 6800 was submitted for standard course review—Spring 2022 Intersession.** AG added

the school is going away from 2 hours to 3 hours and FR noted she asked dean LaVeist directly that if a 2-hour course has justification this is ok. AG commented this is a great course and the students are happy with the course. AG's initial concerns were with contact hours. AG added in the initial course review, Dr. Dal Corso was meeting 5 days in one week. Monday-Thursday from 8-12. and Friday from 8-5 pm, totaling 28 hours and the 2-hour credit course should be 30 hours. Dr. Dal Corso revised this and submitted updated materials. LR added she agreed with AG's comments. In addition, the course title "Community Training Methodologies" is 32 characters with spaces and suggested to get it equal to or below 30 characters with spaces. LR also suggested rewording the course description to make it easier for students to understand. LR asked Dr. Dal Corso if Item #3 "Materials for Making and Using Teaching Aids" will these be provided to students. LR commented item # 5 Grading: Final Grade components, it says "Group Presentations Participation and Attendance: 25%"; LR noted this sounded as if the students are graded only on participation and attendance at presentations, not on the quality of their content and presentations and suggested rewording this. Dr. Dal Corso made all suggested revisions and resubmitted.

AA asked because this is a course requirement does everyone have to take this version or is there an alternative. Dr. Dal Corso added this is just an intersession. Dr. Battle commented SBPS 6800 is currently a required course for the online health sciences program. The issue is this course needs to be a 3-hour credit course for the online community health science program. Dr. Battle added an intersession course does not work for the online community. Dr. Dal Corso added SBPS 6810, was approved in the August CC meeting as a 3-hour credit course for the online community and the intersession course, SBPS 6800 is the 2-hour on-ground course. Dr. Battle asked should this be an adjustment change for the department? FR asked as far as documentation, this course, SBPS 6800 should read on-ground and both course review forms should reflect the credit hours and if it is offered on-ground or online. SC added, how is this written in the catalog? Adding, the degree audit comes from the catalog for graduating student, and not from the program review. If this is not written in the catalog and is taught in Spring 202, every student's degree audit will be incorrect.

CA added this course is short 1 credit hour. Dr. Dal Corso added the MPH students need to take 32 credit hours, and this was his motivation for the 2-hour credit. CA asked how is the course listed in the course catalog now? FR asked MB to ensure these courses are listed in the catalog correctly. FR asked Dr. Battle who is teaching SBPS 6810 currently? Dr. Battle responded Dr. Jeffery Waddy, an adjunct. FR commented that whoever is the professor of record needs to resubmit the cover of the course review form to indicate in the description the differences between SBPS 6800 and SBPS 6810. Dr. Battle added the professor of record is Dr. Dal Corso. FR added that MB will make sure the program review forms are updated. SC commented the degree audit



will come directly from the catalog, adding the catalog does not separate the online vv. on-ground, the degree audit will be incorrect. SC added it cannot be listed as “either or” adding the students program requirements in the catalog lists SBPS 6800 and the degree audits will only recognize SBPS 680 for the online students that take SBPS 6810.

FR commented both courses have been approved and should be in Banner. SC replied the courses are listed in Banner, but the degree audit comes from the catalog, not the program review. FR asked how the courses get in the catalog. SC answered the departments submit this through Courseleaf but this is only done in the Fall semester and the time has passed to do this. FR added CA will follow up with the committee on how each department should submit courses to Courseleaf for the catalog, so the degree audit is accurate. SC noted, for Spring 2022 students that select SBPS 6810, their degree audits will not be correct since this course was not added to the catalog for the Fall semester. A petition will need to be submitted for each student when they are ready to graduate. CA asked if SBPS 6800 is taken the 1<sup>st</sup> year or 2<sup>nd</sup> year. Dr. Dal Corso responded to CA, most MPH students take the course in the spring semester of their second year; adding it may be around 35 students. **LR motioned to approve. AG seconded. Motion carried unanimously.**

### III. Old Business

- A. SPHL 6050: YZ stated that was not reviewed. FR responded there appears to be miscommunication. She didn't know it was up for review today adding that it is on the agenda as “FYI”. In past meetings Dr. White indicated that SPHL 6050 was being split into two classes which would be presented to the CC. No updated documentation has been submitted. FR added she has not seen and updated documentation. YZ stated the purpose of resubmission was to introduce a new course. FR added there was a miscommunication and the CC is not prepared to review the course at this meeting. AA added the EPI faculty had concerns about the split and request more information about the two courses. Concerns include whether EPI students would be prepared for additional BIOS courses and asked about the nature of the changes. FR responded that it was her understanding that one course would be quantitative, and the other designed for students who were not as data oriented. AA added that a potential problem would be if a student wanted to change departments and didn't have the proper BIOS course. She added that many students don't know their concentration their first semester. FR added that we need a full discussion of this move and it was her understanding that before a vote there would be a presentation to the CC. YZ added the course was being reviewed because all the foundational courses were being reviewed, not because it was being changed. FR added that, following the request of Dr. White, it was purposeful to leave SPHL 6050 out of the Foundational Course reviews that occurred because it was being substantively changed. FR apologized for the miscommunication surrounding the course review adding that we will discuss it at the next meeting.

#### **IV. New Business**

- A. FR added she would like more clarity from CA on signature assessments activity, difference between 7000-level and 8000-level courses, learning objectives (as requested by LR) and the review of the foundational courses to reflect all departments (as requested by AG).
- B. New Graduate student grade policy: Dr. Andrinopoulos explained the university voted on a grade change policy related to the PhD and non-professional programs. The PhD and MS programs that are governed by the Graduate Council would also need to adhere to the university's policy related to grading and it would differ slightly. FR added she would send the memo to the CC. Dr. Andrinopoulos added we must be in alignment with this new policy or stricter, but the policy does not have to match the new policy exactly. Dr. Andrinopoulos added to bring Dr. Arcari in on this. SC added if the MS and PhD programs allow a grade of B- but MPH does not and any student that is an MPH student that takes one of those courses, the grade must point to MPH as well as the MS and the only way to do this is with one grading scale. There is trouble with this now, the law school has a different grading scale and there are students in both law school and the school of public health. It's been very difficult to point that degree to one. SC added CA is aware of this and is working on it. TBD in the November CC meeting.
- C. Spring Meeting Dates: All CC members are to send their finalized teaching scheduled to Avery Peterson and anything else that is a regular scheduled meeting, and we will take a poll. CC members added some courses were not approved and many do not know their teaching schedules.

#### **V. For the good of the order- N/A**

**Meeting Adjourned. Next Curriculum Meeting – November 8, 2021, In-person, Reynolds Conference Room, Room 2401, 1:00pm-3:00pm.**