**alification**




Agency for Public Health Education Accreditation

**PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION**

**SELF-EVALUATION HANDBOOK**

Version 4.2. 2023



Contents

[Introduction 4](#_Toc73609441)

[Glossary of Terms 7](#_Toc73609442)

[General Instructions for the Self-Evaluation Report 7](#_Toc73609443)

[Generic template Self-Evaluation Report 10](#_Toc73609444)

[Instructions for the Self-Evaluation Report. 11](#_Toc73609445)

[Criteria, Interpretations and Documentation 13](#_Toc73609446)

[Criterion I: Aims and Objectives of the Public Health Programme 14](#_Toc73609447)

[Criterion II: Governance and Organisation of the Programme 16](#_Toc73609449)

[Criterion III: Learning and Teaching 18](#_Toc73609451)

[Criterion IV: Students and Graduates 21](#_Toc73609453)

[Criterion V: Human Resources and Staffing 27](#_Toc73609455)

[Criterion VI: Supportive Services, Budgeting and Facilities 30](#_Toc73609457)

[Criterion VII: Internal Quality Management 32](#_Toc73609459)

[Appendix I: Core curricula content 35](#_Toc73609462)

[Appendix II: Indicative Site Visit Agenda 36](#_Toc73609463)

[Appendix III: Documents to be Made Available During the Site Visit\* 38](#_Toc73609464)

# Introduction

The following programme accreditation refers to first and second cycle (Bachelor and Master) programmes which focus on public health. The titles of such awards vary widely in the European region and throughout the globe.

The Self-Evaluation process and the resulting report are the core elements of the accreditation process for programmes in public health. The process is meant to support and guide an institution in self-evaluation of both process and outcomes, including the means used to achieve the desired ends. The Self-Evaluation process will help to define the degree to which the ends are achieved, and overall strengths and weaknesses, as well as to put forth possible strategies for programme improvement. This can be of great benefit to the programme. The report will form the basis of a forthcoming site visit and the eventual decision by the Board of Accreditation. All criteria must be addressed within the report.

National quality evaluation systems may put constraints on educational programmes. Where relevant, programmes are encouraged to highlight any national legislative and procedural constraints on reaching the criteria and checkpoints contained within.

If applicants have or are aware of any constraints or restrictions in fulfilling of APHEA criteria these should be accompanied by explanatory text so that they can be taken into consideration by the review.

*“Fitness for purpose” approach*

Based on a fitness for purpose approach, an academic institution will set its mission for education and research within the context of a specific (regional) national environment. This approach necessitates an orderly process for developing programme aims, ongoing assessment to determine how well the aims are carried out, and guidance in using this information in directing and revising final outcomes, curriculum modules, strategies and operations. Ongoing assessment is meant to lead to programme improvement as part of the fitness for purpose approach. In the Self-Evaluation Report, the programme should present current developments and planned changes as they relate to the fitness for purpose process. For purposes of determining conformity with APHEA accreditation criteria, the Board of Accreditation will consider only those matters officially approved and implemented, however, explanation of future plans and developments will give additional insight to the assessment.

*Quality standards*

The intention is for the standards to be specific enough to define what is essential in the education of a public health professional and student at the Bachelor and Master levels. At the same time, standards are intended to be flexible enough to allow for the diversity and richness of public health programmes throughout Europe and the globe, which are very much structured within a very specific and unique local contexts.

The notion underlying the criteria and standards is to set a benchmark and support the improvement in the quality of public health educational programmes. They are not intended to dictate curriculum or administration specific for each programme but rather to provide a framework or guidelines on which each programme will be evaluated.

*Review and accreditation process*

This document discusses the individual accreditation standards and the requirements of the Self-Evaluation Report. The *APHEA Curriculum Validation* as well as the *APHEA Procedures* are also important documents explaining other components of the evaluation process.

*Self-Evaluation Report*

A carefully prepared Self-Evaluation Report is a key element of the accreditation process. Preparing this report can be beneficial to the applicant’s programme as it reviews itself. The site review team later uses this report as the basis for their site visit and the Board of Accreditation uses it as a central element in arriving at the final decision. To encourage comparability of information across programmes and to help foster consistency in the accreditation process, the Self-Evaluation Report should be prepared according to the format specified in these instructions. The burden of proof that the accreditation criteria are met rests with the programme.

*Process Orientation*

The following list provides an overview of major steps in the accreditation process.

1. If a programme has not previously undergone accreditation by APHEA, an application must first be submitted indicating that the programme fulfils the Curriculum Validation.
2. The school is notified by APHEA Secretariat as to whether or not it has passed the Curriculum Validation phase.
3. If so, the programme begins to conduct an analytical self-evaluation. Completion of this phase takes time, usually 4-6 months but may be extended if necessary.
4. The APHEA Secretariat, in correspondence with the school, sets a deadline for the submission of the final Self-Evaluation Report and tentatively schedules the site visit.
5. The school submits the Self-Evaluation Report to the APHEA Secretariat.
6. APHEA Secretariat notifies the school regarding the composition of the review team and inquires about conflicts of interest.
7. APHEA Secretariat sends each review team member the Self-Evaluation Report of the applicant programme and background materials in preparation for the site visit.
8. The school develops a provisional site visit agenda and consults with APHEA Secretariat a month prior to the site visit.
9. The review team conducts visit and determines the validity of the Self-Evaluation Report. The chair of the review team reports major findings to the school officials during the final briefing session.
10. APHEA Secretariat along with the chair of the review team prepares the first draft of the site visit report and distributes to team members for completion/ amendments.
11. Final draft of report is submitted to the school and the director of programme is invited to prepare a written response in 14 days addressing any inaccuracies and factual omissions in the report.
12. Corrections from the school, if any, are discussed with the chair of the review team, and incorporated into the final version of the report when appropriate before it is forwarded to the Board of Accreditation.
13. The Board of Accreditation reviews the report at its next meeting and formulates a recommendation regarding accreditation of the programme.
14. The Board of Accreditation forwards this recommendation to the Board of Directors who will make a final decision.
15. APHEA Secretariat notifies the director and officials of the school of decision.
16. APHEA Secretariat invites the director of the programme to evaluate the process.
17. If a programme is accredited, the final decision is posted on the APHEA website along with the executive summary of the final report. The institution may post the final report in its entirety on its website if it chooses to do so along with the APHEA logo.
18. If a programme is currently accredited, approximately two years before the six year accreditation term expires, APHEA Secretariat notifies the school that the programme will require a further review to re-affirm the accreditation status.

# Glossary of Terms

Please refer to website:<https://www.aphea.be/Pages/A6.MORE/Glossary_of_Terms.html>

# General Instructions for the Self-Evaluation Report

*Language*

The report should be written in English.

*Organisation of Self-Evaluation Report process*

The faculty of the programme is encouraged to utilise the process of preparing the Self-Evaluation Report as an evaluative tool for analysing programme objectives and performance. Although a variety of organisational approaches are appropriate for Self-Evaluation, all faculty assigned to the degree programme unit (as well as related faculty who teach courses for the unit) should be involved in some way. In addition, input should be obtained from students, alumni, other relevant academic departments and employers of programme graduates.

*Preparation time*

The preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report typically takes at least four months. The passage of time allows for assessment of overall performance and whether or not objectives have been met. It also allows an institution to show how information on performance has been used in progressively adapting and revising programme objectives, strategies and operations. Ample time is needed to collect data, involve faculty, students, and alumni, conduct any necessary internal review processes, and synthesize all information in the final report.

*Self-Evaluation cut-off year and time span*

The self-evaluation year for the report focuses heavily on the complete academic year immediately preceding the year in which the report is submitted. However, some criteria, as well as the site visit, require discussion of performance concerning both the year of submission and previous academic years.

*Different versions of the degree programme*

All versions of the degree programme seeking accreditation must be covered in the Self-Evaluation Report. If closely related programmes are offered by the same organisational unit, using essentially the same course offerings, facilities and resources, then one integrated report may be submitted. If there are substantial differences, it will normally be best to submit a separate Self-Evaluation Report for each programme.

*Off-campus and distance education*

When off-campus, distance education or blended learning based versions of the programme serve different aims, programme objectives or student populations, or utilise educational technology or learning methods that differ from the parent programme, these differences should be described and explained fully in order to demonstrate:

* The extent to which educational offerings are consistent with and contribute to the mission;
* The extent to which assessment and guidance processes ensure the comparability of the education offered;
* The effects of these differences on faculty, administrators, systems, processes, and the allocation of programme resources and, ultimately
* The effects of these differences on the education received by all students in the programme seeking accreditation.

*Submission date*

The Self-Evaluation Report is due at the APHEA Secretariat no later than eight weeks prior to the date of the actual site-visit.

*Copies and related material*

The Self-Evaluation Report should be sent to the individual site visit members and secretariat in soft copy at least eight weeks before the arrival of the site team. Applicants should provide at least three hard copies on site. All information regarding the self-evaluation and appendices should be made available electronically.

*Availability of records*

Although they need not be submitted with the Self-Evaluation Report, other information and records should be available on-campus for review by the site review team. This would include such evidence as, a document with the mission statement, results of recent evaluation and assessment processes along with documents on educational, research, staff, and quality assurance policies, course evaluations, thesis projects with executive summaries, sample comprehensive examinations/assessments, student records, brochures, bulletins and posters used in recruiting students, and survey results as well as relevant material used in instruction including access to physical and virtual learning spaces. Please see Appendix III for a list of documents to be presented on-site.

*Pagination, format and concise presentation*

The Self-Evaluation Report should use the exact numbering and format of the instructions. For effective reference, each page of the report should be numbered sequentially. The report should not exceed 35 pages excluding appendices. The Self-Evaluation Report should be submitted in a concise format. It can be single-spaced using 12 point font. While providing the necessary information, the presentation should be concise and to the point.

# Generic template Self-Evaluation Report

|  |
| --- |
| Title page |
| Table of contents |
| List of abbreviations |
| Programme summary |
| Preface |
| Criterion I: Aims and Objectives of the Programme |
| Criterion II: Governance and Organisation of the Programme |
| Criterion III: Learning and Teaching |
| Criterion IV: Students and Graduates |
| Criterion V: Human Resources and Staffing |
| Criterion VI: Supportive Services, Budgeting and Facilities |
| Criterion VII: Internal Quality Management |
| Each criterion will conclude with a summary of strengths and areas for improvement |
| Overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme |
| References |
| Appendices (if applicable) |

# Instructions for the Self-Evaluation Report.

**Title page**

Applicants are provided with a template title page (next page) which should be used as the front page of the Self-Evaluation Report. The address table should be the same as the one used for the Curriculum Validation application so that the two documents can be clearly associated by the site-visit team.

**Programme Summary**

Provide a brief summary of the programme including the specialisations if applicable. This section should include the history of the programme, and its organisational setting as well as the target groups for the programmes output. This general introduction will serve to orient the readers of the report including the site visit team.

**Preface**

As a preface to the Self-Evaluation Report, please provide a brief narrative of the programme being accredited, the manner in which the Self-Evaluation Report was developed, including the process of writing this report, the process of collecting the necessary information (including opportunities for input by important programme constituents such as institutional officers, administrative staff, teaching faculty, students, alumni, and representatives of the public health community at large).

**Title page template to be used**

****

**PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION**

**Self-Evaluation Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Institution name: |  |
| Programme title: |  |
| Address line 1: |  |
| Address line 2: |  |
| Address line 3: |  |
| Town / City: |  |
| Country: |  |
| Name of person completing this document: |  |
| Contact email: |  |
| Date: |  |

Signed by institutional representative

Printed name:

Position:

*(stamp if appropriate)*

# Criteria, Interpretations and Documentation

The criteria/standards outlined here are intended to maintain and improve the quality of public health educational programmes. They are not intended to dictate curriculum or specific administrative processes but rather to provide a framework within which programme will be evaluated.

Each criterion is highlighted in italics and is followed by an interpretation. Each criterion is broken down into a number of sub-criteria, each of which is to be (i) addressed within the Self-Evaluation Report and (ii) supported by required documentation (or other sources of information). Finally, the bulleted checkpoints provide a basis for the arguments and conclusions with respect to each criterion. Specific templates are to be filled out as specified.

## Criterion I: Aims and Objectives of the Public Health Programme

***The programme has a clearly formulated programme aim or set of programme aims, conducive to the development of final outcomes (competences) in public health and which are responsive to changing environment, evidence, health needs and demands of populations.***

INTERPRETATION

From a fitness for purpose approach, an academic institution will set its mission for education and research within a specific environment. A locally rooted public health educational programme is then viewed as instrumental in achieving the institution’s mission by formulating a set of credible programme aims which support the mission of the institute, taking into consideration the specific context.

The programme aims define the domain, margins and/or boundaries of the educational programme at stake. Final outcomes are formulated based on programme aims. The final outcomes describe the competences or qualificaitons a graduate should have acquired after completion of the programme; they make explicit the profile of a graduating student when he or she is entering the labour market.

The final outcomes shape the content, pedagogic methodology, structure and blueprint of the curriculum. These outcomes /competences are then adequately translated into learning objectives for the educational modules (units) within the programme. Final outcomes are achieved by students via the content of one or more educational modules and attainment of the module learning objectives or learning goals.

CRITERION I: SUB-CRITERIA & CHECK POINTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.1 | The programme has explicit programme aims in line with the mission of the host institution. The programme aims:  1.1.1. are clear, concise and realistic.  1.1.2. are in line with the mission of the host institution.  1.1.3. reflect elements of education, research and service.  1.1.4. provide a framework for all programme activities and foster the development of a strong academic and corporate identity.  1.1.5. are shared amongst the staff and host and/or founding institution(s) via websites, social media, literature, etc.  1.1.6. are known and understood by students and stakeholders. |
| 1.2 | The programme aims are adequately transferred into final outcomes that students should have obtained upon graduation.  1.2.1. The relationship between the mission, programme aims and final outcomes is clearly explained. |
| 1.3 | The final outcomes of the programme and learning objectives of the programme elements (i.e., modules, courses) correspond to general, internationally accepted, descriptions of the outcomes or qualifications of an academic programme.  1.3.1. Clearly indicate how the final outcomes and learning objectives of the programme:   * Adequately embody general characteristics of academic education. * Correspond to professional requirements from the national and international public health field as well as from the scientific public health domain. * Include recent public health research and reflect current public health practice. |
| 1.4 | The programme demonstrates appropriate responsiveness to emerging scientific evidence and developments in the public health academic and professional spheres and to changes in the environment and health needs and demands of populations.  1.4.1. The background and development of the programme is clearly explained.  1.4.2. Records illustrate examples of change, indicating the responsiveness of the programme to external changes and contingencies.  1.4.3. Elaborate how the programme is distinctive, in particular, regarding competing or complementary programmes. |

## Strengths and areas for improvement of programme within Criterion I:

Please list the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme within this criterion.

## Criterion II: Governance and Organisation of the Programme

***The governance, organisational structure and processes are appropriate to fulfilling the aim and objectives of the programme, and consistent with the policies and requirements of the host institution****.*

INTERPRETATION

The organisational setting of the programme should support the work of the programme’s constituents and enhance the potential for fulfilment of its aims and objectives, thereby fostering the overall integrity of the programme. All affairs must be carried out fairly and in keeping with the highest ethical standards.

Faculty (academic staff) and students should have formally organised opportunities to take part in decision-making processes within the programme.

The university-level educational systems differ from country to country around the globe. These differences will be taken into account in the APHEA accreditation process to the extent they pose constraints to the programme in fulfilling the APHEA criteria. When applicable or relevant, explain constraints to the programme with respect to the APHEA standards within the context of national educational system requirements.

CRITERION II: SUB-CRITERIA & CHECKPOINTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2.1 | The programme is legally recognised/accredited (if national accreditation exists) by national educational authorities.  2.1.1. Legal recognition of the programme is indicated. |
| 2.2 | The organisational structure effectively supports governance, leadership, management and organisation of the programme.  2.2.1. Responsibilities of persons and rules of governing bodies are made clear.  2.2.2. An organisational chart showing the administrative organisation of the programme, indicating relationships amongst its various components and its links to higher level departments, schools, and divisions is provided.  2.2.3. A brief narrative description accompanies the organisational chart describing the difference in roles and responsibilities.  2.2.4. Official documentation detailing the roles and responsibilities is provided in an appendix  2.2.5. The rights and obligations of administrators, faculty and student representatives in the governance of the programme are made explicit in a constitution, bylaws or other document. |
| 2.3 | There is an academically qualified person (or group) responsible for the coordination of the programme.  2.3.1. There is an explicit mandate to the qualified person (or group) responsible for the coordination of the programme. |

## Strengths and areas for improvement of programme within Criterion II:

Please list the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme within this criterion.

## Criterion III: Learning and Teaching

***The curriculum, learning objectives, educational methodology (teaching concept), assessment procedures and outcomes are consistent with the programme aims and final outcomes of the public health programme.***

INTERPRETATION

A public health programme offers a course of study which provides the student with a sound and solid background in public health. It may also offer courses of study in selected areas of (basic) public health knowledge, sufficient to constitute one or more specialisations within the programme. The programme content falls within the core areas as identified by the APHEA curriculum competences & learning areas (see Appendix I).

The set of final outcomes (as listed in Criterion II of this Self-Evaluation Report) serves as the foundation of the curriculum. The final outcomes are met via the learning objectives of the (or each) programme and its component parts. The learning objectives guide the curriculum and are the primary measure against which student achievement is assessed. Required learning objectives may change and evolve over time, and a programme must assess changing needs to assure the continued relevance of its curriculum to the field of public health.

A typical course of study is described and includes the core components and explains (or describes) how the curriculum components, required modules (core curriculum components), elective modules (additional curriculum components), general competences, minimum degree requirements and internships correlate with the programme’s final outcomes. If the course of study for part-time students differs from that of full-time students, these differences should be described.

The learning and teaching strategies (didactic principles) applied within the programme need to be explained and how the pedagogical methods correspond to the overriding learning and teaching strategies of the programme. The prerequisites for entrance to the programme are reported and, in the event, that the programme has multiple target groups, the prerequisites for each target group are highlighted.

Information concerning assessment of students is also required. Programmes are expected to: explain how core and other curriculum components are assessed as to their quality and consistency in relation to the stated final outcomes of the programme; report and discuss the outcomes related to the programme; provide results that will be useful to APHEA in evaluating the curriculum.

Finally, attention is given to students’ integrating experience or thesis expressed as, "integrating experience" within the Curriculum Validation Application. This integrating experience is a means by which faculty assess whether the student has mastered the curriculum and is able to demonstrate proficiency in required competencies.

CRITERION III: SUB-CRITERIA & CHECK POINTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 3.1 | The learning and teaching strategy as applied throughout the programme is in line with the programme content, aims and final outcomes of the programme. The learning and teaching methods correspond to the learning and teaching strategy of the programme.  3.1.1. All components of the curricula are justified with respect to their consistency with the final outcomes of the programme.  3.1.2. The learning and teaching strategies employed are clear and in line with the programme aims, final outcomes and learning objectives.  3.1.3. The teaching methods in the programme components correspond to the learning and teaching strategies. |
| 3.2 | Students are assessed in an adequate, meaningful and insightful manner by means of evaluations, tests and examinations, to determine whether the learning objectives have been achieved.  3.2.1. An assessment strategy is demonstrated.  3.2.2. The criteria for assessment are verifiable.  3.2.3. A policy and system for re-assessment is in place.  3.2.4. The assessment methods are in line with the learning and teaching strategy of the programme.  3.2.5. The assessment methods are adequately organised and supervised.  3.2.6. The process of tests and assessments are communicated to and are transparent to students.  3.2.7. The procedures used to monitor and assess student progress in achieving the learning objectives are described.  3.2.8. The programme provides adequate and timely feedback of assessments for students. |
| 3.3 | At the end of the programme, students within master programmes are typically required, and bachelors maybe required, to prepare a written document (thesis, dissertation, mémoire, final project) as an integrating experience in which they synthesise and integrate knowledge and skills acquired over the course of the programme.  3.3.1. The content and level of the integrating experiences are in line with the level of the degree awarded.  3.3.2. Students are informed how the integrating experience is supervised and how formative and/or summative assessment feedback is provided.  3.3.3. The integrating experience is evaluated by a formal body via an established process and, and is required for the award of the degree.  3.3.4. Provide a full list of the last graduating cohort theses including: a) student ID, b) Title in English and c) grades. Please provide English abstracts in an appendix for those theses which received the 2 highest marks, 2 middle marks and 2 lowest marks. The full theses of these 6 should then be available in the resource room in their original submission state.  3.3.5. The programme provides evidence that the final outcomes that have been achieved by the graduates of the programme meet the intended final outcomes of the programme. |
| 3.4 | The programme aligns with a three-tier system, the application of credits, and issuance of a Diploma Supplement, credit transcript or Co-Curricular Record.  3.4.1. The programmes adhere to a three-tier system (Bachelor / Master / Doctoral level).  3.4.2. The programme applies a system of skill/competency classification, such as a qualifications framework or learning taxonomy.  3.4.3. The programmes are expressed as, or apply compatible system of credits such as the ECTS (European Credit Transfer system) in the European Higher Education Area or  3.4.4. Students are provided with sufficient documentation to allow them to have their learning recognised in foreign countries, such as credit transcripts, Diploma Supplements or Co-Curricular Record. |
| 3.5 | There are opportunities for international exchange of students.  3.5.1. Students are provided with opportunities for international exchange  3.5.2. An adequate support system for incoming and outgoing students is in place. |

## Strengths and areas for improvement of programme within Criterion III:

Please list the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme within this criterion.

## Criterion IV: Students and Graduates

***The programme has policies and procedures on student recruitment, enrolment, support and follow-up which are assessed and revised regularly.***

INTERPRETATION

The programme admissions criteria must be derived from the aims of the programme and serve as metrics by which the programme monitors its performance. Information regarding these criteria and the recruitment process must be presented to potential students, the public, preceptors, employers, and other interested parties in a clear fashion.

The programme is expected to demonstrate how it monitors with student progression and addresses the causality of any themes encountered with drop-out or prolongations. Any hindrance to student progression should be seen to be addressed by the programme.

Support services must be provided to students throughout the course of the programme and must be evaluated regularly.

The programme is also requested to provide evidence in the methods and nature of monitoring their graduate populations.

Finally, the criteria examine how the programme publicises itself to the internal and external world. Clarity and transparency are monitored to ensure that graduates are given precise and comprehensive information concerning their programme of study.

CRITERION IV: SUB-CRITERIA & CHECK POINTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.1 | The programme has clearly defined admission criteria and recruiting policies coherent with the aim and objectives of the programme.  4.1.1. Recruitment policy and admission criteria, including academic prerequisites (undergraduate degree from a recognised university, language skills, international experience, etc.) are in line with the programme aims and final outcomes of the programme.  4.1.2. Appropriate entrance requirements exist for all target groups, and checks are carried out to ensure that entrants meet these requirements.  4.1.3. Stated application, admission and degree requirements and regulations are applied equally to individual applicants and students regardless of age, gender, ethnic group, disability, religion, or nationality.  4.1.4. The information given to potential entrants provides an adequate and realistic picture of the programme and the career prospects after graduation.  4.1.5. Provide quantitative information on the number of applicants, acceptances and enrolment (also by specialty if applicable) area for the Present cohort, the Last cohort and the Previous to last cohort.  **Complete *template 4.1.5 below***  4.1.6. Provide quantitative information on the educational and employment background of the present student cohort.  **Complete *templates 4.1.6.a and 4.1.6.b below***  4.1.7. Provide quantitative information on the intake of students per programme by region for at least previous three years.  **Complete *template 4.1.7. below*** |
| 4.2 | The programme is achievable for the majority of students.  4.2.1. The perceived study load corresponds to students’ actual study load.  4.2.2. A monitoring system is in place to assess student progress and is used for planning of interventions to prevent drop-outs and prolonged studies.  4.2.3. Provide a quantitative and qualitative description of drop outs and prolonged studies along with a description of any remedial action taken.  4.2.4. The programme monitors the student attrition rate and uses this information to advise students as well as to further develop the programme.  4.2.5. Factors hindering students’ progress are removed to the extent possible.  4.2.6. The programme provides supportive resources for students with special needs related to the learning process and general needs (e.g., visual or hearing impairment, wheelchair access). |
| 4.3 | The programme has access to counselling services for personal, academic and professional development of students.  4.3.1. Tutoring and student counselling services are operative and function adequately.  4.3.2. The student services meet the needs of the students.  4.3.3. Teaching and administrative staff is sufficiently available for consultation with the students. |
| 4.4 | There is a monitoring system of the programme’s graduates.  4.4.1. Evidence of a monitoring system of the graduates allowing collection of data to ascertain that completion of the programme contributes positively to career development.  4.4.2. Provide analysis of employment patterns of graduates: distribution of employment by market sector and function; percentage employed; length of search for employment; major places of employment.  4.4.3. There are proven methods for following up on the students’ career choices and employment paths through such mechanisms as alumni organisations and surveys of stakeholders. |
| 4.5 | The programme has effective communication tools (website, brochures, etc.) to present itself internally and externally.  4.5.1. Description and evidence of the communication tools the programme uses to portray itself internally and externally.  4.5.2. The programme maintains an up-to-date website with complete information regarding courses, requirements, schedules, and teacher profiles.  4.5.3. The programme has clear and explicit regulations and enables students to access information about the programme including school regulations, expected programme learning outcomes, clearly stated progress thresholds, award of credit, requirements for examinations and written work, and the grading system.  4.5.4. Examples of how students receive information about the programme (e.g., website, brochures, academic calendars, bulletins and catalogues explaining course offerings, etc.) References to websites may be included. |
| 4.6 | The programme adheres to national legislation on the protection of personal data.  4.6.1. There are explicit and publicised policies on data protection where they exist either nationally or locally. |

## Strengths and areas for improvement of programme within Criterion IV:

Please list the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme within this criterion.

*Template 4.1.5*

**For the Programme\***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Present annual cohort** | **Last annual cohort** | **Previous to last annual cohort** | **Totals** |
| **Applied** |  |  |  |  |
| **Accepted** |  |  |  |  |
| **Enrolled** |  |  |  |  |
| If the programme consists of a mixture of part-time and full-time students please copy and paste this template and clearly indicate.  If the programme has several recruitment points during the academic calendar - indicate combined annual totals | | | | |

**For specialities (if applicable)** *copy and paste if required*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Speciality 1- please specify* | **Present annual cohort** | **Last annual cohort** | **Previous to last annual cohort** | **Totals** |
| **Applied** |  |  |  |  |
| **Accepted** |  |  |  |  |
| **Enrolled** |  |  |  |  |

*Template 4.1.6.a*

**The distribution (%) of students by employment background at point of entry\*.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Employment background | **Present annual Cohort** | |
|  | **N** | **%** |
| *Add descriptions of employment background* |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ***Total*** |  |  |

\* If applicable. Copy and paste for specialities if appropriate

*Template 4.1.6.b*

**The distribution (%) of students by education background at point of entry.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Education background | **Present annual Cohort** | |
|  | **N** | **%** |
| *Add descriptions of educational background* |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ***Total*** |  |  |

*Template 4.1.7*

**To be completed for the Programme and any specialities therein**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Present annual cohort** | | **Last annual cohort** | | **Previous to last annual cohort** | |
|  |  | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** | **N** | **%** |
| **Programme** | i.Home country |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ii. Regional\* countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | iii. Non Regional countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | *Total* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Speciality 1** | i.Home country |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (if applicable) | ii. Regional\* countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | iii. Non Regional countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | *Total* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Speciality 2** | i.Home country |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (if applicable) | ii. Regional\* countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | iii. Non Regional countries |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ***Total*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Regions as defined by the World Health Organisation. The term "Country" includes "nations" and "states"

## Criterion V: Human Resources and Staffing

***The profile and number of teaching and support staff is appropriate to the provision of the stated programme aims and final outcomes of the programme and its continuous development.***

***The recruitment policy of the programme is consistent with the aim and objectives of the programme.***

INTERPRETATION

The quality of an organisation active in education and research is to a large extent determined by its personnel. The programme must have the ability to meet its identified aims and objectives in light of the current size and composition of its faculty.. Teaching resources may of course be drawn from other departments and schools within the institution, but there must be a central core of faculty to sustain the curriculum.

In judging whether the programme has a sufficient number of academically qualified faculty, factors such as the faculty course load, the depth and breadth of professional (multidisciplinary) backgrounds represented by the faculty, the opportunities for professional interaction among the faculty, and the opportunities for students to be exposed to the appropriate range of content areas within public health, are assessed. A substantive percentage of the faculty actively involved in the programme hold an earned doctorate or other equivalent academic degree in their field. The field of expertise and experience of the faculty reflects the expertise needed to deliver the programme as intended. All faculty with teaching assignments have evidence of learning and teaching qualifications or equivalent formal professional development.

CRITERION V: SUB-CRITERIA & CHECK POINTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.1 | There is a central and stable core of academically qualified and / or experienced teaching staff in sufficient numbers dedicated to the programme.  5.1.1. The qualifications of staff are sufficient to ensure that the programme is provided to the required standards for the actual number of students.  5.1.2. Student–staff ratio is indicated within the programme for the present cohort.  5.1.3. The percentage of staff holding an earned doctorate or other equivalent academic degree is sufficient for the programme.  5.1.4. The percentage of teaching carried out by different departments within the present cohort is demonstrated.  5.1.5. It is demonstrated that faculty turnover is not high. |
| 5.2 | The departments involved or staff members in the programme reflect the multidisciplinary character of public health.  5.2.1. The teaching staff demonstrates backgrounds in varying public health disciplines.  5.2.2. The teaching staff demonstrates knowledge in theory, practice, and methods in public health as well as educational and pedagogical skills.  5.2.3. The teaching staff shows a balance between national, regional and international experience, appropriate to the programme. |
| 5.3 | The programme supports the active involvement of faculty in public health research and service (practice) activities.  5.3.1. A sufficient number of faculty is actively involved in public health research activities.  5.3.2. A sufficient number of faculty is actively involved in public health outreach / social engagement activities. |
| 5.4 | A staff recruitment policy exists outlining the type, responsibilities and balance of academic staff required to adequately delivery the programme curricula.  5.4.1. Staff recruitment policy and standards exist outlining the type, responsibilities and balance of academic staff required to adequately deliver the curriculum.  5.4.2. There exist explicit standards for the recruitment and appointment of teaching staff consistent with the aims and outcomes of the public health programme.  5.4.3. Indicate any differences in procedure for different types/categories of appointments. |
| 5.5 | An appropriately qualified and sufficient administrative/support staff is available for the programme.  5.5.1. The amount of administrative/support staff is sufficient to ensure that the programme is provided at the level of required standards given the actual number of students.  5.5.2. A clear distinction between tasks and responsibilities is documented.  5.5.3. Administrative and support staff working hours are available. |

## Strengths and areas for improvement of programme within Criteria V:

Please list the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme within this criterion.

## Criterion VI: Supportive Services, Budgeting and Facilities

***The accommodation, budget and facilities are adequate to realise the programme aims, final outcomes and learning objectives in line with the educational methodology in an effective and efficient way.***

INTERPRETATION

This criterion requires an assessment of the programme’s ability to meet its aims, outcomes and objectives in light of its support services, including budget, learning resources and identification of the most significant current resources and most critical resource needs. Overall adequacy of resources implies the ability of the programme to assure its continuity and meet its commitment to students and other constituents. The stability of resources is a factor in evaluating their adequacy.

The budgeting process, including when and by whom the budget is prepared and the extent of involvement by the programme manager/director is reviewed. The budget support which has been provided over the past years should be explained, by noting the amount of funding, its source as well as distribution and trends (a table may be used).

CRITERION VI: SUB-CRITERIA & CHECK POINTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 6.1 | The programme has financial resources sufficient to support its stated aims, final outcomes and learning objectives.  6.1.1. The programme has financial resources sufficient to support its educational activities. |
| 6.2 | The learning resources are adequate. Students and staff are provided with sufficient access to these resources inside and outside of usual school working hours.  6.2.1. Sufficient guidance on using these resources is available to the students and staff.  6.2.2. Access is available to resources such as library, relevant scientific literature search engines/databases, online educational materials, etc.  6.2.3. The rules on borrowing material and access hours are clear.  6.2.4. Evidence of opportunities for orientation and assistance to students and staff on using the library/online resources. |
| 6.3 | Appropriate and well-equipped facilities supporting the educational methods of the programme are available.  6.3.1. Evidence that the teaching and learning environments are adequate to meet the educational needs of the programme and allow it to fulfil its aims and objectives. |
| 6.4 | Appropriate computer facilities, including both hardware and software, access to Virtual Learning Environments, internet and appropriate service support are available.  6.4.1. Evidence that there is adequate access and sufficient availability to learning environments, computer facilities and resources for students, faculty, administration and staff. |

## Strengths and areas for improvement of programme within Criterion VI:

Please list the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme within this criterion.

## Criterion VII: Internal Quality Management

***There is an internal system for assuring quality and supporting policy development, decisions, and actions.***

INTERPRETATION

Internal quality assurance mechanisms are crucial to the integrity of the programme and to its long term sustainability. All constituents including students shall be invited to participate in appropriate aspects of the evaluation process. Administrative mechanisms including standing and ad hoc committees should assure strong policy development and implementation.

This criterion primarily relates to achievement of high quality professional education for persons entering the labour market. Flexibility and innovation in curriculum design and means of delivery are necessary in order to meet the diverse educational needs of (full-time and sometimes part-time) students, pre-entry and (if applicable) mid-career students, students who are changing careers and those with interests in different career specialisations within public health. Assessment procedures and measures may take any form appropriate to the programme and given circumstances, but each programme should develop and use its own procedures to determine how well it carries out its aims, final outcomes and curriculum.

The content of a curriculum and the means of communication and teaching in an academic setting change over time. Flexibility and the ability to innovate on the basis of adequate information on governance and teaching are key features of any educational programme seeking to meet the needs of students and staff.

CRITERION VII: SUB-CRITERIA & CHECK POINTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 7.1 | An operational internal quality management system that (i) monitors the curriculum and student progress, and (ii) ensures that concerns of staff and students are readily identified and addressed.  7.1.1. The achievement of the programme aims and learning objectives are assessed via an internal quality management system.  7.1.2. There is evidence of key processes in place which are broadly inclusive of staff, students and stakeholders (employers). See template 7.1 below.  7.1.3. All relevant stakeholders (i.e. faculty, staff, students, alumni and those from professional field/employers) are involved in the programme’s developmental process.  7.1.4. A systematic quality tool, such as, a Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle, for quality assurance and improvement is in place.  7.1.5. Tasks and responsibilities in application of the quality assurance system are well-defined and clear to all actors involved. |
| 7.2 | There is regular and systematic data collection of student and staff feedback concerning learning objectives, content of modules, staffing, and pedagogical approaches and the programme is modified accordingly.  7.2.1. There is evidence of results of the data collection and analysis being fed into the process of developing curriculum and learning objectives. An adequate process of periodic programme evaluation, review and development is in place.  7.2.2. The results of the programme monitoring are used for revision of the programme and a clear feedback and improvement cycle exist.  7.2.3. Examples of changes made in the programme based on feedback received are provided. |
| 7.3 | Feedback on the quality of the programme is provided in a systematic and regular way to faculty, students and other persons involved.  7.3.1. Documentation of feedback to constituents is provided. |
| 7.4 | The programme provides evidence that recommendations received during previous reviews (by APHEA or any other national/international review body) have led to changes in the curriculum or organisation of the programme.  7.4.1. A summary of actions taken based on previous recommendations is provided. |

## Strengths and areas for improvement of programme within Criterion VII:

Please list the strengths and areas for improvement of the programme within this criterion.

*Template 7.1*

**Involvement of stakeholders within the quality assurance system of the programme**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Programme Director | Students | Alumni | Staff members | Educational Committee | Committee of Examiners | Labour market /employers |
| Programme aims |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final outcomes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learning objectives |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Content modules |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

KEY: Indicate influence by way of the following scale:

1 = not at all influential / 2 = slightly influential / 3 = very influential / 4 = extremely influential

## Overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme:

Please review major strengths, weaknesses, and challenges your programme faces and discuss ways of improvement.

# Appendix I: Core curricula content

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CORE SUBJECT AREAS** | **CURRICULUM COMPETENCES & LEARNING AREAS** |
| 1. **Introduction** | 1. Introduction and/or essentials in public health |
| 1. **Methods in public health** | 1. Epidemiological methods, 2. Biostatistical methods, 3. Qualitative research methods, 4. Survey methods |
| 1. **Population health and its determinants** | 1. Environmental sciences (including physical, chemical and biological factors), 2. Communicable disease 3. Non- communicable disease, 4. Occupational health, 5. Social and behavioural sciences, 6. Health risk assessment, 7. Health inequalities along social gradient |
| 1. **Health policy, economics, and management** | 1. Economics, 2. Healthcare systems planning, 3. Organisation and management, 4. Health policy, 5. Financing health services, 6. Health programme evaluation, 7. Health targets |
| 1. **Health education and promotion** | 1. Health education, 2. Health promotion, 3. Health protection and regulation, 4. Disease prevention |
| 1. **Other/Cross-disciplinary themes (mandatory or elective courses)** | 1. Biology for public health, 2. Law, 3. Ethics, 4. Ageing, 5. Nutrition, 6. Maternal and child health, 7. Mental health, 8. Demography, 9. IT use, 10. Health informatics, 11. Leadership and decision- making, 12. Social psychology, 13. Global public health, 14. Marketing, 15. Communication and advocacy, 16. Health anthropology, 17. Human rights, 18. Programme planning and development, 19. Public health genomics, 20. Technology assessment |
| 1. **Integrating Experience, practicum/Internship/ final project /thesis/ dissertation/exam /memoire** | 1. Supervised by faculty (full time and/or adjunct) |

# Appendix II: Indicative Site Visit Agenda

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Day 0. Arrival date:** | | **Location** |
|  | Arrival of review team in country |  |
|  | Preparatory meeting review team (behind closed doors) | Hotel |

| **Day 1.** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Agenda** | **Location** | **Programme Participants** | **Criteria** |
| 09:00 – 09:30 | Arrival of review team on site and welcome by school. Explanation of materials on display and practical arrangements during the site -visit. |  |  | N/A |
| 09:30 – 10:45  **Session 1** | Meeting with programme representatives, board, programme management and author(s) of the Self-Evaluation Report: overview of programme under review, highlighting any special features/ peculiarities of programme; unclear issues as perceived by review team to be put forth. |  |  | 1 & 2 |
| 10:45-11:00 | SESSION DEBRIEF - review team | | | |
| 11:00-12:00  **Session 2** | Non-specified session for continuation of previous sessions or additional requirements based on SED review. |  |  | various |
| 12:00 -12:15 | SESSION DEBRIEF - review team | | | |
| 12:15- 13:15  **Session 3** | Meeting with students (includes student members of advisory bodies at school). Ensure mix of 1st and 2nd year. |  |  | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 |
| 13:15-13:30 | SESSION DEBRIEF - review team | | | |
| 13:30 – 14:30  **Session 4** | Lunch – Light buffet meeting with Alumni. |  |  | 2, 3, 4 & 7 |
| 14:30 - 14:45 | SESSION DEBRIEF - review team | | | |
| 14:45 - 15:45  **Session 5** | Tour of school premises and facilities, preferably guided by students (lecture halls, tutorial rooms, computer facilities, library etc.). |  |  | 6 |
| 15:45-16:00 | SESSION DEBRIEF - review team | | | |
| 16:00 - 17:00  **Session 6** | Meeting with representatives from labour market/stakeholders outside programme. |  |  | 2, 3 & 7 |
| 17.00 - 17.30 | DAILY DEBRIEFING - review team | | | |
| 17.30 | Team return to hotel. |  | N/A |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Evening event if planned |

| **Day 2.** | | | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Agenda** | **Location** | **Programme Participants** | **Criteria** |
| 09:00 – 10:00 | Review of materials |  |  |  |
| 10:00 – 11:30  **Session 7** | Meeting with core staff members (includes members of advisory bodies at school) |  |  | 2, 3, 5 & 7 |
| 11:30-11:45 | SESSION DEBRIEF - review team | | | |
| 11:45 - 12:45  **Session 8** | Review of teaching |  |  | 3, 5 & 6 |
| 12:45 - 13:45 | Light lunch / Internal team consultation hour. | | | |
| 13:45 – 15:00  **Session 9** | Meeting with other representatives of the school.  1: Representative of admissions board  2: Career advisor/ student advisor  3: Head of educational support office |  |  | 4 & 6 |
| 15:00 - 15:15 | SESSION DEBRIEF - review team | | | |
| 15:15 – 16.00  **Session 10** | Meeting with other representatives of the school.   1. Welfare & Accommodation representatives 2. International office 3. Human Resources |  |  |  |
| 16:00 - 16:15 | SESSION DEBRIEF - review team | | | |
| 16:15 – 17.00  **Session 11** | Meeting with other representatives of the school.  7: Representative of examiners’ board  8: Quality management committee |  |  | 3 & 7 |
| 17:00 -17.30 | DAILY DEBRIEFING | | | |
| 17:30 | Return to hotel | | | |

| **Day 3.** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Agenda** | **Location** | **Programme Participants** |
| 09:00 – 12:00 | Review team meeting behind closed doors |  |  |
| 12:00 - 13:00 | (if required) Concluding meeting with school representatives, board, programme management. |  |  |
| 13:00 – 14:30 | Oral presentation on first impression by chair and team. |  |  |
| 14:30 onwards | Site visitors leave |  |  |

# Appendix III: Documents to be Made Available During the Site Visit\*

1. Programme pamphlets and catalogues/publicity material
2. Policy plan regarding research in the programme or similar document(s)
3. Course schedules from past 3 years (if different from Curriculum Validation)
4. Quality assurance policy documents or similar document(s)
5. Results/analysis/documented outcomes of any recent evaluations
6. Six representative sample of integrating experiences (if applicable for Bachelors) i.e. theses, dissertations etc. as highlighted in sub-criterion 3.6.
7. Faculty CVs
8. Representative selection of sample examinations/assessments (presentations, portfolio assessments, work placements) with corresponding assessment criteria and requirements (answer models)
9. The most recent External Examiner comments if available
10. Records of written student complaints and grievances, if any, for the past three years
11. Alumni survey results if available

On line access is required for all site review members. Lap tops should also be available.

**\*** *if programmes have these documents online they are encouraged to include specific weblinks within the Self-Evaluation Report so that the site visit team has more time to digest before their arrival.*