



SITE VISIT REPORT FOR
THE PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION REVIEW
OF THE

Bachelor of Public Health

Faculty of Public Health,
Universitas Airlangga

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AGENCY FOR PUBLIC HEALTH EDUCATION ACCREDITATION
SITE VISIT DATES: Wednesday 2nd to Friday 4th October 2019.

SITE VISIT TEAM:
Professor Ramune Kalediene (Chair)
Professor Samer Hamidi
Dr. Stojniew Jacek Sitko
Dr. Julien Goodman (APHEA Director)

Executive Summary

The site visit Team (hereafter referred to as "the Team") would like to thank all those involved with the site visit and for the preparation of the self-evaluation documentation (SED), the Curriculum Validation process and the logistical preparations and hospitality during the visit. The carefully prepared and detailed documentation provided the Team with a clear understanding of the Programme and a baseline from which to verify, clarify and engage in discussion and debate with various internal and external partners and stakeholders during the site visit.

Criterion I: Governance and Organisation of the Programme

Internally, governance structures are very well understood and received throughout the school and the team were very aware that the programme adheres to national regulations and requirements concerning student's involvement in management. The team would however, recommend that the programme might benefit from considering a more transparent inclusion of faculty and students in its existing governing bodies.

Criterion II: Aims and Objectives of the Public Health Programme

The team were really impressed with the unity, commitment and shared understanding of the programme by staff, students and stakeholders. Everyone interviewed was very well informed and involved in fulfilling the mission of the school and aims of the programme. The team also observed that the school aimed at delivering a very high-quality Bachelors degree. Most impressive was the focus of the school and programme on community service which is rarely seen to such an extent in other countries. To this, the team recommended that the programme should promote more widely its achievements internationally. The programme was found to use a broad range of Essential Learning Outcomes which are set nationally. The range of these outcomes raises the question whether the sub-categories of learning outcomes could be effectively monitored. The suggestion would be to concentrate on the fewer most important outcome measures and continually monitor and assess the effectiveness and practicability of the learning outcomes for the graduates of the programme.

Criterion III: The Curriculum

The strength of the programme was obvious from the self-evaluation documentation which included an impressive study plan and wide variety of integrating experiences including, practicums, internships, fieldwork and thesis. The strength of this latter research component was found to be (positively) unusual at this level of study. The team also noted the heavy local focus of

the curriculum which would benefit and strengthened by including international good practices. The team also noted the use of e-learning and recommended that the programme continue to expand the online learning components. This can be achieved alongside ensuring the relevant support for faculty and students whilst ensuring the range of teaching methods employed are made more explicit and further communicated.

The team found that the assessment process was clear and transparent and clearly mapped against an impressive set of learning outcomes. Moving forward, the programme might consider providing a written evaluation of the thesis and make it accessible for the student before the viva is undertaken as well to look at integrating external examiners from outside of the university.

There was evidence found of incoming students from outside of Indonesia and the team would urge the programme to investigate the potential to increase international student mobility.

Criterion IV: Students and Graduates

The visiting team was impressed with the interest shown by the applicants in studying on the programme which was considered another proof of the value of the programme in the region. There was also a recognition that the school and university were implementing new facilities to cater for students with special needs which should be continued. Student support and supervision services, including the range of “soft skill” training seminars available for students were also seen to be helping alumni find professional positions. The student career progression system employed came across as highly effective and valuable.

The programme’s alumni were found to be a very active group with whom the school maintains a lasting relationship which also includes an outstanding alumni response rate to surveys produced by the programme. The programme may wish to capitalise on the work already committed by the alumni through formalising some of the activities presently conducted solely by the alumni groups.

Employment of students was deemed to be an asset of the programme with the vast majority of students finding employment within the health system. The team also noted that the programme employs a wide variety of means to inform previous, present and potential students and the programme’s highly developed so called Cyber-campus is a good example. The programme should continue to develop these various elements which include a variety of social media but should also focus on enhancing the website which remains the main external communications tool.

Criterion V: Human Resources and Staffing

The team recognises the commitment of the Deans and Vice-Deans to the programme and the dedicated faculty members and staff in the development of the up-to-date curriculum. The faculty were clearly linked to external stakeholders but could also benefit from greater exposure to international good practices. Faculty members were found to be involved in research and it would be beneficial to encourage more involvement of faculty members in international research submitting to high impact journals outside of the university and local context.

One of the strengths of the programme were the well-developed roles and responsibilities of Vice-Deans and coordinators. However, the team did witness some overlapping of the differing layers of management which will deserve attention as the programme moves forward.

Meetings with students and alumni highlighted how they felt supported by the programme and faculty both within and after their studies. The commitment of the university was duly noted and recognised by all connected with the programme.

Criterion VI: Supportive Services, Budgeting and Facilities

The team had visited the facilities of the programme and were satisfied with what was witnessed on site. Being aware that changes, including the construction of the new hostel, were taking place, the team would simply encourage and support the school in its present and ongoing development.

Criterion VII: Internal Quality Management

The team found a very robust quality management system which came from the Ministries, through the university into the programme as well as number of other outside quality assessments the university, faculty and program went through. What wasn't particularly clear within this system was how individuals had access to the results of the feedback. The recommendation was to make the results of the analysis easily accessible to all those people who have taken part within the quality systems and to internal and external stakeholders. The programme's emphasis on data collection seemed to be generating an amount of data which was unclear as to how that data was being synthesised and utilised for the benefit of feedback and programme improvement. In this sense the programme may wish to consider, identifying the essential elements of the quality system and how they are incorporated in their quality improvement processes.

Summary of Conclusions

Criterion I: Governance and Organisation of the Programme	
Sub – Criterion 1.1	Met
Sub – Criterion 1.2	Met with comments
Sub – Criterion 1.3	Met
Sub – Criterion 1.4	Partially met with comments
Criterion II: Aims and Objectives of the Public Health Programme	
Sub – Criterion 2.1	Met
Sub – Criterion 2.2	Met
Sub – Criterion 2.3	Met
Sub – Criterion 2.4	Met
Criterion III: The Curriculum	
Sub – Criterion 3.1	Met
Sub – Criterion 3.2	Met
Sub – Criterion 3.3	Met with comments
Sub – Criterion 3.4	Met
Sub – Criterion 3.5	Met
Sub – Criterion 3.6	Met
Sub – Criterion 3.7	Met
Sub – Criterion 3.8	Met
Criterion IV: Students and Graduates	
Sub – Criterion 4.1	Met
Sub – Criterion 4.2	Met
Sub – Criterion 4.3	Met
Sub – Criterion 4.4	Met
Sub – Criterion 4.5	Met with comments
Criterion V: Human Resources and Staffing	
Sub – Criterion 5.1	Met
Sub – Criterion 5.2	Met with comments
Criterion VI: Supportive Services, Budgeting and Facilities	
Sub – Criterion 6.1	Met
Sub – Criterion 6.2	Met
Sub – Criterion 6.3	Met
Sub – Criterion 6.4	Met
Criterion VII: Internal Quality Management	
Sub – Criterion 7.1	Met
Sub – Criterion 7.2	Met
Sub – Criterion 7.3	Met with comments
Sub – Criterion 7.4	Met