

INTERNATIONAL ACCREDITATION IN PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION



Reviewer Roles, Self-Evaluation & Reporting

CPD ACCREDITORS MANUAL



INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION &
ADVANCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. Introduction | 3 |
| 2. The role of the Reviewers | 3 |
| 3. Components of the self-evaluation report | 4 |
| Annex 1 – Structure of the evaluation report | 7 |

1. Introduction

The Continuing Professional Development (CPD) evaluation serves as an ongoing mechanism for enhancing the quality and effectiveness of workforce development. CPD can be delivered by a range of providers, including training institutes, academic institutions and professional bodies. Evaluation integrates various periodic review exercises and assessments across different CPD offerings to ensure relevance and impact.

The main goals of CPD evaluation are:

1. To support the development of a culture of continuous quality improvement among CPD providers and participants;
2. To assess the evolution and effectiveness of CPD activities and promote ongoing enhancement of their quality and relevance;
3. To provide stakeholders, such as public health professionals, employers and policymakers with transparent information about the performance and outcomes of CPD initiatives;
4. To support the recognition and credibility of CPD certifications and learning outcomes within the public health sector.

The CPD evaluation bestows, maintains or withdraws its accreditation, by assessing quality indicators and standards related to its governance and strategy, its contribution to society, its scientific and pedagogical project, the intended learning outcomes to be acquired by participants, the adequacy of its resources and its compliance with the mandatory standards for internal and external quality assurance.

2. The role of the Accreditation Reviewers

The Accreditation Reviewer Panel will make judgements for each of the criteria based around five basic principles: Full Compliance, Substantial Compliance, Partial Compliance, Non-Compliance and Non-Applicability.

- **Full Compliance:** where all the elements have been satisfactorily met.
- **Substantial Compliance:** Where all elements have been met to a certain degree, but improvements can be made to improve the-development of the CPD training in line with the criterion.
- **Partial Compliance:** Where the CPD course meets the minimal requirements of the criterion but where wider development would significantly improve the CPD course and the possibility of improving the decision grading in the future.
- **Non-Compliance:** Where the CPD course fails to fulfil the basic requisites of the criterion in question.
- **Not-Applicable:** This section refers to elements which may be outside of the control of the CPD course (e.g. national legislation) and, therefore, renders the elements of the criterion not-applicable in specific circumstances.

For courses under 40 hours, one subject matter expert will be assigned as the reviewer. For courses over 40 hours, two reviewers will be assigned. If their findings differ, a third external reviewer will be contracted to make the final recommendation.

Courses exceeding 40 hours also require a brief tele-review. This allows reviewers to meet with key internal and external stakeholders to discuss the course. These sessions are tailored to the reviewers' lines of enquiry and typically last between one and three hours.

For courses under 40 hours, reviewers may request clarification or modifications. In such cases, applicants receive detailed feedback outlining the required changes and, if necessary, may be invited to a short teleconference. If the reviewer deems the amendments satisfactory, the review process concludes.

After completing the review of all the criteria, the Accreditation Reviewers need to combine all those evaluation elements into a holistic vision to reach a final decision of Accreditation, Conditional Accreditation or Denial/Revocation of Accreditation about the CPD course under evaluation.

In addition to these above decisions, the Accreditation Reviewers should highlight areas of good practice found which will be noted in the reports. Any CPD course, vastly exceeding the criteria may be noted as Gold Practice with commensurate notification in the report and certification.

When writing the report, the Accreditation Reviewers need to take in consideration the need for the report to be clear and accessible to the academic community, external partners and other interested individuals.

3. The components of the Self-evaluation report

Course Aims and Decision-Making

The first set of criteria refer to the aims of the CPD course and the structures in place to support its development and delivery. Reviewers should consider whether the course has clearly stated aims and learning outcomes that are consistent with its purpose and appropriate to its intended audience. They should assess how these aims align with the mission and strategic priorities of the host institution and whether the course demonstrates a meaningful contribution to public health practice. Particular attention should be paid to whether the course outlines its distinctiveness and intended impact in areas such as workforce development, community engagement or policy. Reviewers should also examine the course's organisational arrangements and governance. They should determine whether there is a clear structure in place that supports the effective planning and delivery of the course and whether decision making is clearly allocated and involves relevant stakeholders.

Participants and Engagement

The second set of criteria refer to the participants and delivery of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses. Reviewers should consider whether the intended audience and admission procedures are clearly defined and appropriate in light of the course aims. They should assess the inclusiveness and transparency of participant selection and whether these processes are consistent with the purpose and learning objectives of the course. Reviewers should also review whether, if applicable, the eligibility criteria ensure participants are suitably prepared to benefit from the course. Reviewers should examine how the CPD course

is structured and delivered and determine whether the teaching methods and content are aligned with the intended learning outcomes. They should analyse whether the course supports the practical application of learning. Where assessments are used, their alignment with learning outcomes and their contribution to the learning process should be evaluated. Particular attention should be paid to whether the course design supports engagement and accessibility. Finally, reviewers should assess how participation is defined and recognised, including the clarity and transparency of any certification or credit arrangements. They should consider how the requirements for recognition are communicated, implemented and recognised.

Resources

The third set of criteria refer to the resources available to support the delivery of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses. Reviewers should consider whether the course is supported by an appropriate and adequately qualified teaching team and whether the physical, digital and learning resources are sufficient to meet the stated aims and learning outcomes. They should assess whether the trainers possess relevant academic or professional expertise and whether administrative and technical support roles are clearly defined and effectively contribute to the organisation and delivery of the course. Reviewers should also examine whether the course is supported by suitable teaching and learning materials and whether these are accessible and aligned with the intended learning outcomes. This includes the provision of essential and supplementary resources such as core texts, online platforms, databases or other relevant tools that enhance the learning experience and support achievement. In addition, reviewers should assess the clarity, accuracy and accessibility of the public information provided by the institution in relation to its CPD offer. This includes information on the content and structure of the course, its intended audience, duration, expected learning outcomes and the type of certification awarded upon completion. Reviewers should consider whether this information is up to date and whether it supports informed decision making by prospective participants and stakeholders.

Quality Assurance, Financing and Integrity

The final set of criteria refer to the systems in place to ensure quality, transparency and integrity in the design and delivery of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) courses. Reviewers should consider whether there is a clear and coherent approach to quality assurance and enhancement that supports regular course review and continuous improvement. They should assess how feedback from participants and relevant stakeholders is collected and used to inform course development. Reviewers should also determine whether the course remains responsive to changes in workforce needs and public health priorities and whether any external reference points or standards contribute to its ongoing relevance and quality. Reviewers should also examine how the course is financed and whether financial arrangements are transparent and appropriately managed. They should consider the extent to which the institution ensures the independence and integrity of the course by identifying and managing any actual or potential conflicts of interest. Particular attention should be paid to whether safeguards are in place to prevent undue influence from external funders or partners and whether internal procedures support ethical and impartial delivery of the course content.

Annex 1 – Structure of the evaluation report

1. Title of CPD Course

2. Reviewers (Chair)

.....

3. Evaluation of the different areas

1. Course Aims and Decision-Making

1.1. Course Aims, Outcomes, Distinctiveness & Social Accountability

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

1.2. Organisation & Decision Making

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

2. Educational offer and students

2.1. Audience & Admissions

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

2.2. Learning & Assessment

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

2.3. Participation & Awards

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

3. Resources

3.1. Human & Physical / Online Resources

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

3.2. Public Information

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

4. Quality Assurance, Financing and Integrity

4.1. Quality Assurance & Enhancement

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

4.2. Financing & Conflicts Of Interest

Full compliance ☐ Substantial compliance ☐ Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐ Not-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

Reviewer recommendations

Accreditation ☐ Conditional Accreditation ☐ Non-Accreditation ☐

Justification (maximum 2 pages)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

Good or Gold Practice

Good Practice ☐ Gold Practice ☐

Criterion number & Justification (maximum 1 page)