

Curriculum Committee Meeting
Reynolds Conference Room-2401
April 5, 2023
10:00am- 12:00pm
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. Assafa Abdelghani (AG), ENHS Rep; Dr. Amanda Anderson (AA), EPID Rep; Dr. Charles Stoecker (CS), HPAM Rep; Dr. Dominique Meekers (DM), IHSD Rep; Dr. David Seal (DS), SBPS Rep; Dr. Latha Rajan (LR), TRMD Rep; Amanda Hercules (AH), SGA Vice President

Ex Officio and Advising Attendees: Dr. Christine Arcari (CA), Sr. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Other Faculty in Attendance: Katherine Andrinopoulos; Maya Begaliev (MB); Arachu Castro, Lorelei Cropley (LC)

- I. **March 1, 2023, Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes.** CS made a motion to approve, DS seconded the motion. All in favor; motion carried by majority quorum.

- II. **Curriculum Review**

- A. **Course Review**

- a) **SPHU 2420: Health Challenges and Climate Change (formerly Climate Change and Health -Tabled at March CC meeting)** submitted for initial offering for Fall 2023. The responsible faculty is Lorelei Cropley. The peer reviewers are **Charles Stoecker and Latha Rajan.**

- i. LC updated after reviewing with AG the following changes were made: the course title changed, the overlap and course content was reviewed and made necessary updates so there is no overlap with ENHS 6450. In addition, the objectives were reduced to 5, and the notes from the pre-reviewers were addressed in the revised submission.
 - ii. CS commented that the overlap looks good, and the verb level shows progression. Originally each learning objective was not mapped to a single assessment. There wasn't enough detail in the signature assessments. There wasn't enough detail on the course calendar. The discussion quizzes did not contain details about how the points work, a rubric was added with details on participation. All was updated.

- iii. LR recommended adding a cover letter that shows the differences between ENHS 6450 and SPHU 2420. In the revised cover letter, the requested table was not added.

CS made a motion to approve with the submission of a revised cover letter listing the difference in LOs. LR seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously. LC updated she will submit this by April 10th.

b) SPHU 2410: Health and Women’s Rights submitted for initial offering for Fall 2023. The responsible faculty is Arachu Castro. The peer reviewers are **David Seal and Assaf Abdelghani**.

- i. AG comments include the exam were not mentioned in the original submission. The D+/D- was not included, this was updated. In the rubric, both exam materials presented by students were not specific. The schedule did not list when exams are scheduled. Also, the attendance policy/withdrawal was unclear.
- ii. DS commented he was satisfied with the comments to the original critiques. The course looks great and will be successful.
- iii. FR asked CA about the attendance policy as stated in the syllabi. Is it ok for the professor to give a “WF” if a student misses 5 classes? CA reviewed the [NTC policy](#) *{Instructors are authorized to lower the grades of students who are absent excessively without a satisfactory excuse or do not make up work missed because of absences. With the approval of the Assistant Dean of Advising (contact: advising@tulane.edu), an instructor may have a student who has excessive absences involuntarily dropped from a course with a WF grade after written warning at any time during the semester.}*
- iv. CA noted there should be an edit to Castro’s policy that a student with 5 or more absences may be dropped from the course with the approval of the Assistant Dean of Advising.
- v. LR and FR agreed providing a written warning to the student at the 4th missed absence and notifying the advisor may be helpful, but not required. CA added as a response back from the CC after 4 missed classes the CC expects the instructor to send an email warning to the student. And at 5 missed absences the advising

team should be contacted before giving a “WF”. This should not be noted in the syllabus but noted for Arachu Castro.

- vi. AA added in the schedule of classes the column that maps the LOs to the individual session is not present. FR added, if this is not required, it’s not needed.

AG made a motion to approve, DS seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.

- c) **TRMD 6040: Early Intro to Lab Research** submitted for initial offering for Fall 2023. The responsible faculty is Berlin Londono-Renteria and Claudia Herrera. The peer reviewers are **Charles Stoecker and Amanda Anderson.**

- i. AA commented on the Step 2 form there should be an indication of the semesters in which the course will be offered and the frequency. The LOs are written from the perspective of the instructor and should be written to reflect the student’s objectives. The LOs do not map to the cited competencies. CA clarified this is not needed for a 0-credit hour course. AA was not clear on the number of points to receive a grade of “S”—please specify a minimum total number of points. The course descriptions on the Step 2 form and the syllabus are different, this needs to be updated.
- ii. CS added there are 6 program competencies in the LO table in the Step 2 form and on the syllabus, but they are labeled as LOs. CS agreed the LOs in the table are from the view of the instructor and should be from the student. CS suggested checking Bloom’s taxonomy for approved learning verbs that may work.

CS made a motion to table; AA seconded the motion. All in favor, motion carried unanimously.

B. Program Review

- a) **MBA/MHA Joint Program** changes submitted by Charles Stoecker. The reviewers are **Felicia Rabito and Christine Arcari.**
 - i. 3 years ago, the MHA went from 60 credits to 54 credits. The submission records the changes that were made. There were no changes to required courses and no changes to competencies. In the original joint MBA/MHA there were courses cross-listed in the 60-credit hour program, some courses were

removed, and some were added. No additional comments from CC. No vote was needed for this administrative change.

b) MPH in CHS submitted by Maya Begalieva. The peer reviewers are **Yaozhong Liu and Dominique Meekers**.

- i. MB added the last review was in 2017/2018. The main changes include the online offering, reviewing the discrepancies between online and residential courses, and the realignment of objectives and competencies. **This program is being reviewed for online offering only.**
- ii. DM noted on page 2, the 1st mission goal -research related objectives- are important for the department but not for the program, this was removed. Under the 3rd original goal- service related- strengthening partnerships was revised to increase practicum opportunities. Under program competencies, it wasn't clear what "analyzing the nature of public health issues...", this was revised. Section 5, the contribution to the SPHTM mission was rewritten to explain what the department and program are doing.
- iii. YZ agreed with DM's comments. Both reviewers are satisfied with the final version.

DM made a motion to approve, YZ seconded the motion. All in favor; motion carried unanimously.

III. New Business

- a) **Innovation in Teaching Award** – Patty Kissinger is enlisting the assistance of the CC to develop a new faculty award for creativity, engagement, research, and innovation with a monetary prize attached.
 - i. DS suggested looking at other school's models who may have similar awards.
 - ii. FR questioned whether courses that use an instructional designer like SRM or Noodle are eligible for an award.
 - iii. CA recommended that students nominate faculty for this award. The CC is set up to approve curriculum before it's taught and it's difficult for the CC to identify what innovation means from a course review. In response to FR's comments, CA disagreed with innovation mainly happening in the Online Programs. In addition, the instructional designers' roles are limited. Their role is to aid in the faculty's vision of the course they are developing.

- iv. SGA Vice President, Amanda Hercules, added they offer a faculty award as well.
- v. AA suggested changing the name from “Innovation” to “Impactful”.
- vi. CA suggested this to be a faculty, staff, and student (maybe alumni too) nomination. Then the nominees provide a teaching statement/philosophy. Evaluations should be reviewed, and a committee should be formed to identify the top nominees.