

Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine

Curriculum Committee Meeting

Reynolds Conference Room-2401

August 3, 2022- 9:00am- 11:00am

Zoom: <https://tulane.zoom.us/j/95434937094>

Draft Minutes

Committee Members in Attendance:

Dr. Felicia Rabito (FR), Faculty Chair
Dr. Amanda Anderson (AA), EPID Rep
Dr. Assafa Abdelghani (AG), ENHS Rep
Dr. David Seal (DS), SBPS Rep
Dr. Yaozhong Liu (YZ), BIOS Rep
Dr. Latha Rajan (LR), TRMD Rep
Dr. Dominique Meekers (DM), IHSD Rep

Ex Officio and Advising Attendees:

Dr. Christine Arcari (CA), Sr. Associate Dean Academic Affairs
Susan Cantrell (SC), Enrollment Manager

Other Faculty in Attendance:

Mark Wilson
TJ Stranova on behalf of Charles Stoecker (TJS), HPAM rep
Kenneth Orie

- I. **May 10th, 2022, Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes- AG made a motion to approve, DM seconded the motion. New member, DS abstained. All in favor; motion carried by majority quorum.**
- II. **Curriculum Review- All courses on the agenda are part of the MSPH in Industrial Hygiene. All courses were pre-reviewed by the Curriculum Committee. After reviewing all courses, the Curriculum Committee agreed to table the following courses and a follow up review will be held in September: ENHS 6030, ENHS 6300, ENHS 6540, ENHS 6700, and ENHS 7620.**
 - a. **ENHS 6600- Principles of Toxicology submitted for standard review – (Faculty, Charles Miller, and Elizabeth James) the peer reviewers are Latha Rajan and Amanda Anderson.**

AA: The syllabus for the online section was requested to be added to the review but is not available. The course scheduling in the syllabus did not map to learning objectives. Dr. Miller clarified this. Section 4-- Explanation of Evaluation Methods -- did not contain all details of all evaluation methods, this was updated. The signature assignment column needed a brief description added of the assessment that explains how it addresses the objective. The syllabus' the learning objectives embedded in the course schedule differed from those in the course review form and later in the syllabus.

LR: LR agreed with AA's comments. The online syllabus was not provided for a full review. Major assignments should be used instead of minor assignments in the learning

objectives. Number 6 --Course Evals originally contained a comment to explain how student feedback is used to improve the course-- The comment was removed when revised materials were submitted. It is suggested to add the comment to explain this section. The learning objectives are confusing as there are class objectives embedded with the learning objectives. The course schedule has class objectives for each session. Students may find it confusing to have two sets of objectives - since the course has its learning objectives. LR suggested to rename those in the schedule as "session goals".

AA: The online syllabus is needed to complete the review.

AA made a motion to approve pending changes; LR seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

- b. ENHS 6620- Physical Agents & Ergonomic Hazards in the Workplace submitted for standard review – (Faculty, Roy Rando) the peer reviewers are Dominique Meekers and Charles Stoecker.**

DM: The course review was missing grading rubrics but was clarified in email. The mapping table was not included with the original submission, revisions were submitted. DM questioned the 'late assignments' definition- Roy Rando corrected the terminology. All revisions were submitted, and DM was satisfied.

TJS on behalf of CS: CS was satisfied with the revised materials.

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

- c. ENHS 6720- Principles of Industrial Hygiene submitted for standard review – (Faculty, William Bullock) the peer reviewers are Dominique Meekers and Amanda Anderson.**

AA: The competency table was missing from the syllabus but was submitted. The learning objectives contained 2 verbs and was suggested to consolidate to 1 verb. (CA and FR confirmed 2 verbs are ok for course reviews but not program reviews) William Bullock revised as suggested by AA.

DM: In addition to AA's comments, a grading rubric was requested.

DM and AA were satisfied with revised materials.

AA made a motion to approve; DM seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion was carried unanimously.

- d. ENHS 7110- Industrial Ventilation & Chemical Hazard Control submitted for standard review – (Faculty, Roy Rando) the peer reviewers are Charles Stoecker and David Seal.**

DS: on page 1 of course review in 'Course Type' the two selections were confusing and can be limited to one 'program requirement'. The 'submitted for review' boxes on course reviews are all blank and should be signed before submitting for review. No additional comments.

TJS on behalf of CS: No additional comments.

DS made a motion to approve; AG seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion was carried unanimously.

- e. ENHS 7310- Occupational Laws & Compliance submitted for standard review – (Faculty, Kenneth Orié) the peer reviewers are Latha Rajan and Dominique Meekers.**

LR: The instructor on the course and the instructor on the evals are different names. In the evals, there were negative comments about the instructor's responsiveness. CA added, this should be reported to her, Dean LaVeist, and Patty Kissinger. The rubric

requires clarification on the points. The oral is worth 10 points and the written is worth 15 points. DM added the '10/15' needs to be deleted. LR suggested to cut down the number of words in the course description to less than 120 words. In course type, it was suggested to remove 'free elective'. LR asked CA why is this a 2-credit hour course and not 3-credit hours. CA explained this is fine as it is a program requirement, and the program has a total of 47 credit hours. But in 'Course Type' on page 1 of course review form to list this as a 'program requirement' only.

DM: Initially there was no competency table included with the syllabus. This was submitted. The summary of assignments table is correct, but it only added up to 95%. Students aren't told how they get to 100%. DM suggested to start the section on course grading with a sentence that lists the grade components that are listed on the form (this would add the class participation/discussion @ 5%). A very nice explanation of how Dr. Orié responded to student feedback. But it says that discussions count for 5% of the grade. It was suggested to change this to "class attendance and discussions" to make it consistent with the final grade components that are listed.

DM made a motion to approve with minor changes; LR seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion was carried unanimously.

f. ENHS 7500- Air Sampling & Analysis submitted for standard review – (Faculty, Mark Wilson) the peer reviewers are Yaozhong Liu and Charles Stoecker.

YZ: In the syllabus as well in the course review form, it was suggested to remove BIOS 6030, since BIOS 6030 is now formally replaced by SPHL 6050. Learning Objectives #4 and #5 were similar, one is for gases, and another is for particulates. It was suggested to consolidate the two to reduce the number of learning objectives. The learning objectives contained low level (level 1 and level 2) Bloom taxonomy verbs, e.g., define, describe, discuss, and explain. As a 7000-level advanced course, it was suggested to modify the learning objectives to a higher level (level 3 or above) Bloom taxonomy verbs to match the advanced level of this course.

TJS on behalf of CS: no additional comments

YZ made a motion to approve with revisions; AG seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion was carried unanimously.

g. ENHS 6030- Survey of Environmental Health submitted for standard review – (Faculty, Mark Wilson and Assafa Abdelghani) the peer reviewers are Yaozhong Liu and Amanda Anderson.

AA: AA would like to see a response to the course evals regarding the number of live sessions. The on-ground version of the syllabus was provided with competency mapping table. In the mapping table 'discuss current risk assessment methods' at the end of Learning objectives #3 and #4 contained 2 verbs. AA would like to see more detail provided about how competencies are addressed. CA agreed that #4 should be split as it contains more than 1 learning objective.

YZ: YZ agreed with AA on learning objectives. YZ suggested to split the learning objectives, especially #3.

FR: The signature assessments need to be more specific.

LR: The grading scale contains 70 and below as a "C" and recommended updating this.

AA made a motion to table for next meeting. DM seconded the motion. All in favor. The motion was carried unanimously.

Next CC meeting is Wednesday, September 7th 9am-11am, Reynolds Board Room- TDW- 2401.