

**Curriculum Committee Meeting**  
Reynolds Conference Room-2401  
January 11, 2023  
10:00am- 12:00pm  
Zoom: <https://tulane.zoom.us/j/95434937094>

**Minutes**

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Dr. Felicia Rabito, 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

**Ex Officio and Advising Attendees:**

Katherine Andrinopoulos (KA), Director of Doctoral Programs  
Susan Cantrell, Enrollment Manager

**Committee Members Not in Attendance:**

Dr. Christine Arcari (CA), Senior Assoc. Dean for Academic Affairs  
SGA Representative

**Other Faculty in Attendance:**

Sylvia Ley  
Richard Priore

- I. **January 11, 2023, Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes.** DM made a motion to approve, DS seconded the motion. All in favor; motion carried unanimously.
  
- II. **Course Reviews**
  - a. **HPAM 7100: Population Health Analytics** submitted for final course review (Initial offering Spring 2022). The responsible faculty is Andrew Anderson. The peer reviewers are **Amanda Anderson and Assaf Abdelghani.**
    - i. AA sent notes 2 days before the meeting but have not received a follow-up from Andrew Anderson. The evals were great and any previous feedback from students were addressed. Initially, the course had no prerequisites or corequisites. CS confirmed Intro to Biostats will be a prereq, and this will be updated in the revised materials. AA added on page 1 of the course review it should include an indication that this is a 'Final course review' and the course was initially offered in Spring 2022. On page 2, section 2 an update to the confirmed pre-req (Intro to Biostats) and select if Instructor Approval Required is needed. On page 2, section 2 there are missing fields, the semester(s) offered and the frequency in which the course will be offered. On page 3, section 4

'Explanation of Evaluation Methods', AA advised Andrew to copy what is in the syllabus which provides an explanation of each method. On course review form, AA advised Andrew to add grade component percentages from syllabus in 'Final grade components'. In the syllabus course scheduling a column is needed in which LOs are addressed per session.

**No additional feedback from AG or committee. AA made a motion to approve with minor changes, LR seconded the motion. All is favor; motion carried unanimously.**

- b. **EPID 6700: Lifecourse Epidemiology** submitted for initial course offering. The responsible faculty is Sylvia Ley. The peer reviewers are **Yaozhong Liu and Charles Stoecker**.
  - i. YZ added the course is well prepared and organized. The syllabus format and class schedule in syllabus was updated. Rubrics for homework, group study, and proposals were suggested to be added and Sylvia Ley updated materials.
  - ii. CS added he asked Sylvia to pick a single signature assessment and map it and this was updated. In addition, the original submission did not include enough contact hours, and this was updated. There was originally a midterm and a final, now there is only a final and extra assignments were added.

**No additional feedback from the committee. CS made a motion to approve, YZ seconded the motion. All in favor; motion carried unanimously.**

- c. **SPHL 8010: Budget and Financial Management** submitted for initial offering. The responsible faculty are Richard Priore and Charles Stoecker. The peer reviewers are **Latha Rajan and David Seal**.
  - i. DS added all minor updates were completed. There were a few competencies that needed to be addressed. The grading rubric and the grades were not consistent. Richard confirmed he received a grading rubric from Latha Rajan and will send revisions soon.
  - ii. LR comments included using abbreviated title on page 1 of course review, in addition, updating that this is a program requirement. The LOs need verbs updated to Bloom's taxonomy levels 5 and 6 since this is an 8000-level course. The grade distribution table needed to be changed. Earning 50% (grade of C) gives the student a Pass in the course. Although the instructors have flexibility in deciding the grade distributions, the table deviates too much from SPHTM policies. LR provided a table from one of her courses below to aid in the revisions. LR recommended that the Learning Objectives table be the same in both Course review form and syllabus.

- iii. LR questioned incentivizing course evaluation completions and if total can go above 100%. LR asked if the added Course eval & Comp assessment was meant as Extra Credit.
  - 1. DS felt this is an ethical issue. Evals are optional and students should not be penalized and should not lose points. Evals are typically not focused on any learning for the students but used as a tool to improve the course.
  - 2. DM had no clear opinion on the matter.
  - 3. AA felt it gave an unfair advantage to students.
  - 4. YZ had no comments on the course evals.
  - 5. KA added standardizing the evals would be helpful. The magnitude of the impact on the grade is the issue.
  - 6. FR is against these added evals for extra credit. Points should not be given for completing a course eval when the school sends an optional eval.
- iv. Richard Priore noted that the added course eval is not like the optional university course evaluations. It is an anonymous student self-assessment. The self-assessment has not been developed for this course. However, based on another course in Finance in Management, the self-assessment involves the students rating their confidence on a scale of 1-5, in being able to do a specific task such as developing a budget with revenue and expenses. This is done pre-course and post course. It is used as a data point to show an improvement in the student's self-assessment and that the course is solid.
- v. FR liked the student self-assessment. The University does not have any rules about an instructor giving credit for a course evaluation, there is no issue with the 2% given as it relates to this course.
- vi. LR added she liked the course assessment since the students are evaluating the content and assessing their learning but recommended that this is added into the 100% instead of 102%. DS agreed.

**Peer reviewers recommend that the self-assessment not be bonus points but be rolled into the 100% (this is up to the instructor), the LOs verbs be elevated to levels 5 and 6, and modifications to the grading distribution. LR made a motion to approve with minor changes, AG seconded the motion. DS abstained; motion carried by majority quorum.**

### III. Certificate Review

- a. **Public Health Graduate Certificate** submitted for initial offering. The responsible faculty is Christine Arcari. The peer reviewers are **Amanda Anderson and Dominique Meekers**.
  - i. DM- this is a PH certificate that consists of the 5 foundational courses. The certificate is open to all students that have a bachelor's degree. DM felt the certificate was

straightforward and well done. DM added in his email exchange with CA, she explained we currently do not offer stackable certificates but when we do, this will be the first certificate in the series. From a marketing perspective, DM felt that professionals already on the job would go for skill-based certificates first, but the certificate is a good idea. Susan Cantrell added students will enroll as a certificate seeking student into the SPHTM and once the certificate is complete, students will receive a certificate signed by the Dean and their degree audit will reflect the completion. FR added it seems to make more sense that people would prefer a skill-based certificate and felt unsure about the interest students would have in obtaining this certificate.

- ii. AA added the certificate is intended for students that may not meet the criteria for a specific department. The certificate provides students the opportunity to show their performance in the 5 foundational courses before enrolling in an MPH program. AA added she had no additional comments on the certificate. The section 'Assessments' was left blank on the form. CA provided an explanation, and it just needs to be transposed to the certificate review form. {Assessment Statement: The Certificate of Public Health meets the CEPH mandated 22 foundational competencies. Assessment of competencies will be measured by student performance on the signature assessments in each course. A mapping of competencies, learning objectives, and signature assessments is included in each course syllabus.}
- iii. LR questioned if the certificate should specify students with an undergraduate degree other than BSPH.
- iv. FR would like to know if there are any restrictions on students that have taken some of the courses previously. For example, if a student completed 3 of 5 courses and would like to enroll, should a student take other courses totaling 15 credit hours in its place. Susan updated that typically, students would not get a certificate if they have not completed the 15 credit hours. CA would need to confirm for this certificate.

**FR made a motion to table the review; LR agreed. CS, AA, and DM wanted to vote. DS and YZ remained neutral.**

**No motion carried.**

IV. New Business

- a. Course Evals TBD in March meeting