

Summary of key changes & principles for proposed MPH foundational knowledge & competency revisions

This proposed revision was grounded in the Council's guiding principles for the revision process, available [here](#), and draws on the results from the Council's late 2024-early 2025 survey on MPH foundational competencies.

- 1) The Council sought to eliminate compound statements whenever possible, simplifying to the highest-level skill or clearest statement of a concept.
- 2) The Council proposes a new approach to foundational knowledge: the proposed revised criterion (MPH.1) removes the verbs (e.g., "Explain...") currently in Criterion D1 and aims to distill the concepts to communicate most clearly the content areas required by the curriculum. Assessments were never required for MPH foundational knowledge, so having statements written as if they are designed for assessment was not optimal.

This change would allow units to approach foundational knowledge areas in a way that makes sense for their curriculum. The aim is to increase flexibility while still ensuring that students are exposed to important content.

- 3) The Council hopes to continue to position units that wish to do so to see foundational knowledge and foundational competencies as complementary and integrated, rather than inadvertently suggesting that the content in foundational knowledge areas is less important than the foundational competencies or that the two are separate. Ideally, the knowledge areas define fundamental content in which students are grounded, and the competencies define the skills students learn to perform, often within the content areas. For example
 - A course providing content in *ecological factors, including climate change* (FK10) might have assignments in which students *assess the quality of data sources for potential bias or misinformation* (FC4), *assess the impact of policies on public health* (FC13), and *apply a systems thinking tool to diagram a public health issue* (FC20).
 - A course providing content in *legislative processes for passing public health laws* (FK7) might have assignments in which students *interpret results of data analysis for public health research, policy, or practice* (FC5), *propose strategies to build coalitions for influencing public health outcomes* (FC8), and *advocate for policies to improve health* (FC12).
- 4) The Council sought to remove from the foundational competencies (Criterion MPH.2) any elements that primarily address what a student knows (factual knowledge), as opposed to a skill they can perform in a variety of different settings throughout a career. These statements are more sensibly defined as knowledge areas.
- 5) The Council removed some skills that emerged as lower priority in [our survey](#) and in the Council's collective judgment. We understand that some units will wish to continue to address these skills for their students, but they would no longer be required for all MPH students.
- 6) The Council sought to add skills that have emerged as important in the decade since the 2016 criteria were adopted, reflecting societal and technological developments. The Council sought to do so in a manner well-positioned to remain relevant for the next 5-10 years. For example, while facility with AI would likely be important for students in order to perform a number of competencies, the competency statements focus on the skills without naming the technology. The interpretation guide, which can be updated over time without revising criteria, provides suggestions, and units can tailor their curricula to reflect faculty expertise on current technological and social developments. CEPH criteria define a baseline expectation, and units use their expertise to construct a curriculum that addresses CEPH requirements and their sense of workforce needs.