INTERNATIONAL ACCREDITATION IN PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION

Reviewer Roles, Self-Evaluation & Reporting

PROGRAMME ACCREDITORS MANUAL

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION & ADVANCEMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION

www.icaphe.org

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Higher education institutions develop their activities according to their strategic goals, assuring their education, research, third mission and commitment to society. The Programme Evaluation aims at being a continuous instrument for improvement of the Public Health Education sector, integrating different periodic evaluation exercises as well as evaluations of all its study programmes.

The main goals of a programme evaluation are:

1. To contribute to the development of its internal quality management culture.
2. To evaluate the evolution of the Programme and to promote the continuous improvement of its quality.
3. To provide society with relevant information about the performance and the results of the Programme.
4. To contribute to the recognition of its degrees and diplomas.

The programme evaluation bestows (1st evaluation), 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 students, the adequacy of its resources and its compliance with the mandatory standards for internal and external quality assurance.

2. The role of the Accreditation Review Panel

The Accreditation Review 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 Programme in line with the criterion.

➢ **Partial Compliance**: Where the Programme meets the minimal requirements of the criterion but where wider development would significantly improve the Programme and the possibility of improving the decision grading in the future.

➢ **Non-Compliance**: Where the Programme 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 Programme (e.g. national legislation, hosting institution's mandatory requirements) and, therefore, renders the elements of the criterion not-applicable in specific circumstances.

After completing the review of all the criteria, the Accreditation Review Panel needs 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 Programme under evaluation.

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

When writing the report, the Accreditation Review Panel needs 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

This first section of the Programme's Self-Evaluation Report (SER) includes a short section with contextual information with a general characterization of the Programme, namely its brief history, the education and public health contexts as well as the reasons for applying for accreditation.

The first set of criteria begin with the Programme's aims and decision-making processes. The Accreditation Review Panel evaluates the clarity of the Programme's aims and intended learning outcomes, their alignment with institutional and national priorities and the overall coherence of curriculum design. The Panel assesses whether these outcomes are effectively embedded within the curriculum structure, content, teaching methods and assessment strategies. They also examine the Programme's design, approval and monitoring procedures, paying particular attention to the involvement of stakeholders and the Programme's responsiveness to evolving labour market needs. Mechanisms for continuous curriculum development, student performance monitoring and adaptability are reviewed in this context. In addition, the Panel considers the governance structures in place, focusing on transparency, inclusivity and accountability. They assess how roles and responsibilities are defined, how decisions are made and how both internal and external stakeholders are engaged in the management and strategic direction of the Programme.

The second set of criteria refers to the student experience throughout their time in the Programme. The Accreditation Review Panel assesses how effectively the Programme recruits, admits and integrates students in a manner that is transparent, inclusive and aligned with its aims. The Panel evaluates whether recruitment strategies promote diversity and student success, including fair recognition of prior learning and equitable admission practices. They also consider how well students are inducted and supported to ensure successful integration and retention. Regarding academic progression and assessment, the Panel examines how the Programme monitors student development, encourages active learning and employs diverse, student-centred teaching methods. They evaluate whether assessment strategies align with intended learning outcomes, how feedback is provided and whether policies for academic integrity, moderation and appeals are clearly defined and implemented. This set of criteria concludes with the Panel's evaluation of how well the Programme prepares students for employment or further study, considering the integration of professional and ethical

competencies into the curriculum, engagement with stakeholders and opportunities for real-world application. Finally, the Panel assesses the Programme's career support systems, graduate tracking and provision of recognised qualifications.

The third set of criteria refers to research, innovation and internationalisation, focusing on how the Programme embeds these areas as core elements of public health education. The Accreditation Review Panel examines the structures established to support scientific research, the level of staff involvement and the extent of student engagement through initiatives such as scholarships, internships and collaborative projects. The Panel considers how research activity contributes to learning and fosters interdisciplinary collaboration. They also assess the Programme's commitment to social accountability and innovation by evaluating its engagement with communities, support for entrepreneurial development and integration of societal priorities into the curriculum. In addition, the Panel reviews how the Programme promotes internationalisation through coherent strategies, dedicated structures and activities that broaden global perspectives and enhance the experiences of both students and staff.

Criteria set four refers to resources and focuses on how the Programme ensures high-quality delivery through its academic, administrative and support systems, as well as its financial and public communication infrastructure. The Accreditation Review Panel examines the qualifications, recruitment processes and professional development opportunities available to teaching staff, alongside their capacity to respond to a diverse student population and contribute to a collaborative and innovative academic environment. The Panel also evaluates the adequacy and training of technical, administrative and managerial staff, ensuring that operational functions are effectively supported. Financial sustainability is assessed through the planning and allocation of resources, with particular attention given to mechanisms that support students financially, such as scholarships and mobility funding. The Panel further reviews the provision of holistic support services, including wellbeing, safeguarding, accessibility and social support such as accommodation, meals and counselling. Finally, the Panel evaluates how the Programme communicates publicly, assessing whether information on areas such as admissions, curriculum, qualifications and outcomes are transparent, accurate, accessible and regularly updated.

The last criteria set deals with Quality. The Accreditation Review Panel has to evaluate to what extent the Internal Quality Management System (IQMS) of the Programme is functional and effective, thus enabling the Programme to plan, implement, monitor and improve the activities in the different areas. The Accreditation Review Panel has to be satisfied that the results and conclusions produced by the IQMS are systemically used in the strategic management and governance of the Programme and in all the decision-making processes, assuring continuous improvement of education, research, cooperation with society and all the different support services of the institution. The Accreditation Review Panel needs to certify that the information system is robust and that there are mechanisms encouraging the participation of the academic and research staff, of the technical, administrative and management staff and of the students in the quality systems.

The Accreditation Review Panel evaluates the systems the Programme has in place for external quality assurance and the extent to which they verify the effectives of the Programme, safeguard academic standards and build stakeholder trust. The Panel also evaluates the Programme's responsiveness to regulatory requirements and emerging needs. The Panel has to be satisfied that the Programme's external quality assurance systems contribute to a culture

of accountability, innovation and continuous improvement aligned to the Programme's mission and strategic priorities. The Accreditation Review Panel needs to certify that that the internal and external quality assurance systems are robust and that there are mechanisms encouraging the participation of the academic and research staff, of the technical, administrative and management staff, students and stakeholders in the programme's quality management/assurance systems.

The Accreditation Review Panel should take into consideration the results of previous accreditations, paying special attention to how the Programme has reacted to recommendations and/or implemented measures or changes in reply to conditions. The Programme should confirm that it intends to apply for a re-accreditation within a period of six years or when the present accreditation expires.

Annex 1 – Structure of the evaluation report

1. Name of the programme ………………………………………………………………..

2. Composition of the Accreditation Review Panel   ………………………………… (Chair)

………………………………..

………………………………

………………………………

3. Evaluation of the different areas

1. Programme Aims and Decision-Making

1.1. Aims and Outcomes

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

1.2. Design, approval and programme monitoring

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

1.3. Organisation and Decision Making

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

2. Student Experience and Lifecycle

2.1. Recruitment, Admissions and Integration

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

2.2. Progression, Assessment and Academic Integrity

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

2.3. Workforce Preparedness, Employability and Career Prospects

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

3. Research, Innovation, Internationalisation

3.1. Research

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

3.2. Social Accountability and Innovation

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

3.3. International Strategies, Engagement and Experiences

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

4. Resources

4.1. Teaching staff: Engagement, Qualifications and Development

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

4.2. Technical, administrative and management staff

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

4.3. Financial Resources

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

4.4. Holistic Support Resources

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

4.5. Public Information

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

5. Quality Systems

5.1. Internal Quality System

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

5.2. External Quality System

Full compliance ☐   Substantial compliance ☐   Partial compliance ☐
Non-compliance ☐   Non-applicable ☐

Justification (maximum 1 page)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

Recommendation of the Accreditation Review Panel

Accreditation ☐   Conditional Accreditation   ☐   No Accreditation ☐

Justification (maximum 3 pages)

Recommendations and/or Conditions (maximum 1 page)

Good or Gold Practice

Good Practice ☐   Gold Practice   ☐

Criterion number & Justification (maximum 1 page)