APHEA Reviewer Training

Participant Handbook

OVERVIEW OF THE DAY

This one day reviewers' training session is intended to support experienced as well as new reviewers. The aim is to give both a holistic and in-depth hands on understanding of the processes used in the APHEA accreditation processes.

The first session of the day will focus on providing the participants with an overall picture of the processes from both the reviewer and reviewed perspectives. It will also give an opportunity for participants to raise any initial questions they may have.

The second session will then focus on the self-study processes and introduce participants to two of the seven criteria (criteria 1 and 2) and how to extract information from supplied data and subsequently how to use this data to form interrogatory lines of questioning.

The final session of the day will concentrate on the practical skills of conducting meetings within the two criterion relating to students. This session will attempt to generate a real-life scenario using students from schools of public health.

Contents

TENTATIVE AGENDA GUIDE

09.30   09.45   Welcome and introduction.

09.45   10.30   Overview of Accreditation Processes

      a) Overview of process:

         From application to final decision

      b) Reviewer's perspective:

         focus on timetabling and team roles when conducting site visit

      c) School perspective:

         focus on positives and negatives of process

      d) Questions and Answers

10.30   11.30   Self Study Analysis

      Up to 3 small teams break out session to review the self-evaluation documents and generate at least 2 questions per criteria. (*See both Appendix A in this document and ANNEX A attached*)

11.30   12.00   Feedback sessions on information found and also any questions it raised.

12.00   13.00   Lunch

13.00   13.20   Introduction & Preparation for role-play (small teams develop chair and questions)

13.20   14.00   Role-play discussions with Students

14.00   14.10   Feedback preparation

14.10   14.45   Feedback from reviewers and panels

14.45   **15.00**   Any further questions and wrap-up session.

OBJECTIVES & INSTRUCTIONS

Activity 1. Overview of Accreditation Processes

Objectives:

- Introduce participants to overall accreditation process

- Opportunity to learn from personal insights and experiences in the process

- Participants given understanding of the reviewed school's perspective

Instructions:

- Participants to bring any questions to the meeting they would like to be answered.

Activity 2. Self Study Analysis

Objectives:

- Getting to know the accreditation criteria and check points

- Understanding the self-study process

- Know how to extract information from the self-study documents

- Understand how to identify missing areas of information and form questions

Instructions:

- Split into 3 smaller groups.

- Each group given text from real self-study as well as APHEA criteria and checkpoints.

- Groups elect chairs

- Discussion of the check points found and not found

- Group given Likert scale which has to complete based on text.

- Clarification and missing parts to form questions

- Groups present their findings and example questions in plenary session

Activity 3. Role-play sessions

Objectives:

- Participants given hands-on experience of interview scenarios

- Understanding the roles of the chair and participants

- Knowledge of dealing in an international climate

- Experience of providing feedback

Instructions:

- Split into two groups

- Groups then separated in to "reviewers" and "panellists" and be joined by students from the ASSPH

- Reviewers will be responsible for asking the questions to the students:

  The reviewers preparation will consist of: being given a series of check points (see appendix B) that they will be asked to verify. To do this they will need to elect a chair, decide how best to construct the questions and conduct themselves in the interviews.

- Panellists will be responsible for assessing the reviewers:

  The panellists preparation will consist of: Deciding on which aspects or attributes they wish to monitor, including such areas as the type and nature of questions asked by the reviewers (for example, did they use the right questions or lines of interrogation to uncover evidence?), their approach or etiquette to the meetings, any general findings.

- Both reviewers and panellists will prepare themselves for 15 minutes and then will be faced with up to 3 students who will have been given limited instruction as to what to expect. It will be for the panellists to extract the required information out from the students. Each panellist will be expected to ask at least 1 question.

- A plenary feedback session will then be conducted for reviewers and panellists to express their experiences and observations as well as any areas they would like to raise.

  Feedback for the reviewers should be based around how much they believe the check points were assessed (using the Likert scale) along with any areas or recommendations for self-improvement.

  For the panellists, feedback should be given to the reviewers using the headings of **COMMENTS** (can be positive, neutral or negative) and **RECOMMENDATIONS** (areas for consideration) as used during accreditation feedback**.**

APPENDIX A: ACTIVITY 2. Self Study Analysis

Criterion I: Governance and Organisation of the Programme

SUB-CRITERIA

LIKERT SCALE = : 5 = Large extent, 4= Certain extent, 3 = Not sure, 2 = Limited Extent, 1 = Not at all

GROUP THINK: How far did the information in the self-study provide evidence for the criterion?*

		5	4	3	2	1
1.1	The institution is legally recognised/accredited (if national accreditation exists) by national educational authorities and allowed to deliver the Master programme and issue degrees.					
1.2	The organisational structure effectively supports governance, leadership, management and organisation of the Master programme.					
1.3	There is an academically qualified person (or group) responsible for the coordination of the Master programme.					
1.4	Student representatives are involved in the management of the programme.					
1.5	The institution demonstrates awareness of other organisations providing competing or complementary training nationally and internationally.					

CHECKPOINTS

1.1	Legal recognition of the institution is indicated. The consequences of any particular constraints in terms of the fulfilment of APHEA criteria are explained. Any accreditation documents produced for other (national or international) quality review purposes are accompanied by a clear explanatory note.
1.2	Responsibilities of persons and rules of governing bodies are made clear. 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. This chart needs to be accompanied by descriptions of the roles and responsibilities of the units within. The programme's governance and committee structure/function/composition and processes are clear. The rights and obligations of administrators, faculty and students in the governance of the programme are made explicit in a constitution, bylaws or other document. The programme administration and faculty have clearly defined rights and responsibilities concerning programme governance and academic policies.
1.3	There is an explicit mandate to the qualified person (or group) responsible for the coordination of the programme.
1.4	There is evidence that student representatives are involved in the management of the programme.
1.5	There is documented knowledge by those responsible for the programme of organisations providing competing or complementary training.

Criterion II: Aims and Objectives of the Public Health Programme

SUB-CRITERIA		GROUP THINK: How far did the information in the self-study provide evidence for the criterion?*				
LIKERT SCALE = : 5 = Large extent, 4= Certain extent, 3 = Not sure, 2 = Limited Extent, 1 = Not at all						
2.1	The programme has explicit programme aims in line with the mission of the institution.	5	4	3	2	1
2.2	The programme aims are adequately transferred into final qualifications that students should have obtained upon graduation.	5	4	3	2	1
2.3	The final qualifications of the programme and learning objectives of the distinctive programme elements (i.e. modules, courses) correspond to general, internationally accepted descriptions of the qualifications of an academic Master programme.	5	4	3	2	1
2.4	The programme demonstrates appropriate responsiveness to emerging scientific evidence and developments in the public health academic and professional spheres, change in the environment and health needs and demands of populations.	5	4	3	2	1

CHECKPOINTS

2.1	The background and development of the programme is clearly explained. The mission of the institute and the programme aims are clear, concise and realistic, and are communicated to and shared by relevant stakeholders (via information leaflets, homepage, etc.). There is evidence that: The programme aims are shared amongst the staff and host and/or founding institution(s) and known to students and stakeholders. The programme aims provide a framework for all programme activities and foster the development of a strong academic and corporate identity.
2.2	The relationship between the mission, programme aims and final qualifications is clearly explained.
2.3	The final qualifications of the programme adequately embody general characteristics of academic education. The final qualifications and learning objectives include recent public health research and reflect current public health practice. The final qualifications and learning objectives correspond to professional requirements from the national and international public health field as well as from the scientific public health domain.
2.4	Records illustrate examples of (substantial) change, indicating the responsiveness of the programme to external changes and contingencies.

APPENDIX B. ROLE PLAY
Meeting with students to discuss and review:

The following 14 Check points come directly from the accreditation procedures for the student section. Panellists are advised to work sequentially through the points and to raise as many as time will allow. Reviewers should try to create questions to address check points and example questions are found below in case of need. Reviewers are encouraged to be creative and courteous.

LIKERT SCALE = : 5 = Large extent, 4= Certain extent, 3 = Not sure, 2 = Limited Extent, 1 = Not at all

		How far did the information given in the meeting provide evidence for the check point?				
		5	4	3	2	1
S.CP.1.	There is evidence that student representatives are involved in the management of the programme.					
S.CP.2.	The core components of the curriculum provide a thorough teaching.					
S.CP.3.	The didactic concept is in line with the programme aims and final qualifications.					
S.CP.4.	Students are assessed in an adequate, meaningful and insightful manner.					
S.CP.5.	Students are required to prepare a written document as a final product.					
S.CP.6.	There are opportunities for international exchange of students.					
S.CP.7.	The programme has clearly defined admission criteria and recruiting policies.					
S.CP.8.	The programme is achievable in terms of workload.					
S.CP.9.	The institution provides accessible counselling services.					
S.CP.10.	The learning resources and guidance are adequate.					
S.CP.11.	Appropriate and well-equipped classrooms are available.					
S.CP.12.	Appropriate computer facilities are available.					
S.CP.13.	There is continuous data collection and analysis.					

S.CP.14.	Feedback on quality of the programme is provided to faculty, students and other persons involved.	5	4	3	2	1

Example questions for potential consideration

S.Q.1.   What were your reasons for electing to do this programme?

S.Q.2.   Are you generally satisfied with your experience in the programme?

S.Q.3.   Has the programme met your expectations and how do you assess the quality of instruction?

S.Q.4.   Can you be specific about satisfying and disappointing aspects of your experience here?

S.Q.5.   How do you perceive the objectives of the programme?

S.Q.6.   Is the curriculum consistent with the goals and objectives of the programme?

S.Q.7.   Is the curriculum consistent with your goals and objectives?

S.Q.8.   Do you feel like your skill set has increased? Give some examples.

S.Q.9.   Is there enough information communicated to students about the results of the programme evaluations?

S.Q.10. Are you able to influence the content and form of educational modules?

S.Q.11. Given your participation in the programme to date, do you think the programme will succeed in the long term?

S.Q.12. Describe student involvement in research, if any.

S.Q.13. Are you able to input into the management of the programme?

S.Q.14. How does the program/school respond to student feedback?

S.Q.15. How do you give feedback?

S.Q.16. Is your opinion about and input on the programme as a student taken into account?

S.Q.17. Are you able to influence the content and structure of the programme?

S.Q.18. If applicable, describe your role in governance/membership of formal academic bodies connected with the programme.

S.Q.19. What happens if a student does not perform well?

S.Q.20. How do you perceive the study load?

S.Q.21. What happens if you fail an exam?

S.Q.22. Is there a system of compensation of educational units and/or marks?

S.Q.23. Are staff members easily accessible to you?

S.Q.24. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum?

S.Q.25. Do you feel like the programme provides you with the latest developments in scientific evidence?

S.Q.26. Which single educational experience in this programme have you enjoyed most?

S.Q.27. Generally speaking, how would you characterise your "typical" professor?

S.Q.28. Do professors use a variety of teaching methods seeking to make courses interesting and dynamic?

S.Q.29. What are some teaching methods that teachers use in the programme that you find very effective?

S.Q.30. Have the results of faculty or course evaluations made any difference?

S.Q.31. Are there opportunities to provide input into school or programme decision- and policy- making?

S.Q.32. Who in your judgement are the drivers of change and development in the programme (i.e. the dean, the programme head, the faculty, labour market, etc.)?

S.Q.33. What is your assessment of the academic support services - the library, computer facilities, etc.?

S.Q.34. How often do you use the library? Are the resources available in the library sufficient to support your studies?

S.Q.35. Do you feel there are sufficient online material and subscriptions available to support your studies?

S.Q.36. What is your evaluation of student services - internships, career counselling and placement, and the like?

S.Q.37. Describe the practicum placement, if applicable (i.e. How do you select a site? What is the role of your faculty advisor throughout the process? How is your work assessed?)

S.Q.38. What guidance did you receive or was offered to you during the process of writing your thesis? Was it sufficient?

S.Q.39. What are the program's/school's best points?

S.Q.40. What would you like to see changed/what could make the program/school stronger?

S.Q.41. What has been the participation of students in compiling the self-study report?

S.Q.42. Do you think your education will effectively prepare (for alumni: has effectively prepared) you for entry into and/or advancement in the work force?

S.Q.43. What are some improvements you would recommend for the programme? Why?

S.Q.44. Why did you choose this program?

S.Q.45. Describe advisement.

S.Q.46. Describe career advisement.

S.Q.47. Would you recommend the programme to others? Why or why not?

S.Q.48. How do you perceive your preparation for writing the thesis/dissertation?