

# Reaccreditation and deviation framework - Information for CPD providers

PSA Accredited CPD

June  
2026

## 1. Purpose and background

PSA Accredited CPD activities have a standard expiry period of 2 years. Before the expiry date is reached, a CPD provider may apply to have the expiry date of their activity extended. This extension is only permitted where specific criteria for extension, outlined in the PSA Accredited CPD Provider Handbook, are met. Alternatively, a CPD provider may have their CPD activity reaccredited if they wish to retain the accredited status of the activity.

The extent of review required at the point of reaccreditation by the PSA Accredited CPD team will vary between activities. Where an activity is submitted for reaccreditation without changes, or only with minor administrative changes, a full accreditation assessment against the *PSA Standards for Continuing Professional Development for Pharmacists* and the associated fee would be disproportionate to the amount of time taken to undertake a review. Conversely, where an activity requires substantial or major changes at the point of reaccreditation, a more thorough review of the activity is warranted.

Where a CPD provider wishes to make changes to an accredited CPD activity prior to the expiry, they are required to submit a deviation. The PSA Accredited CPD team must evaluate the changes against the *PSA Standards for Continuing Professional Development for Pharmacists* to assess whether the deviation will impact the ongoing accredited status of the activity.

This framework can be used to determine the scope of review undertaken at reaccreditation or on submission of a deviation, and the information a CPD provider needs to provide. It also outlines the fees payable for reaccreditation or assessment of a deviation.

This framework applies to:

- CPD providers seeking reaccreditation of an activity
- CPD providers submitting a deviation from accreditation
- all staff involved in the CPD accreditation process, including accreditation assessors.

## 2. Banding framework overview

This framework sets out three review bandings – Minor, Intermediate and Major. Each banding has associated criteria that support the assessor to determine which banding applies to a given set of changes. These criteria also give CPD providers a clear and consistent basis for understanding why an activity has been assigned to a particular banding. The framework also allows for flexibility to adjust to a higher band where the circumstances of a change warrant a higher level of review than the criteria alone would indicate, and where determined necessary by the Lead – CPD Accreditation.

### 2.1 Minor (deviation)

- **Details:** Administrative or cosmetic changes that do not affect the educational content, intended outcomes, or quality of the activity.
- **Extent of review:** Desktop confirmation by PSA Accredited CPD team that the changes notified fall within the Minor criteria. No reassessment against the *PSA Standards for Continuing Professional Development for Pharmacists* is required.
- **Provider submission requirements:** The provider submits an application for reaccreditation by email or *Deviation from accreditation form* depending on the circumstance, together with updated activity materials.
- **Expected outcome:**
  - Reaccreditation: Accreditation is renewed from up to the standard accreditation expiry period, subject to confirmation that the changes meet the Minor criteria.
  - Deviation: The deviation is granted for the activity up until the existing accreditation expiry date.
- **Fee:** A minor administration fee applies.

### 2.2 Intermediate (deviation with review)

- **Details:** Changes to the activity's structure, presentation or supporting elements, such as its content presenters, or assessment, where the core learning outcomes and intent remain unchanged.
- **Extent of review:** Review by an assessor of the updated activity materials, focused on the *PSA Standards for Continuing Professional Development for Pharmacists* criteria relevant to the change(s) made by the provider. This is not a full assessment against every Standard.
- **Provider submission requirements:** The provider submits an application for reaccreditation by email or *Deviation from accreditation form* depending on the circumstance, together with updated activity materials.
- **Expected outcome:**

- Reaccreditation: Accreditation is renewed up to the standard accreditation expiry period, subject to satisfactory review.
- Deviation: The deviation is granted for the activity up until the existing expiry date, subject to satisfactory review.
- **Fee:** A fee that reflects the assessor time to review applies.

### 2.3 Major (full review required)

- **Details:** Changes substantial enough that the activity should, for accreditation purposes, be treated as a new application. Examples may include significant changes to learning outcomes, content or design, target audience, or assessment, or where issues are identified with presenter expertise, conflicts of interest, or the currency of the evidence base.
- **Extent of review:** A full reassessment applies against all *PSA Standards for Continuing Professional Development for Pharmacists*, equivalent to a new application.
- **Provider submission requirements:** A full accreditation submission as outlined in the *PSA Accredited CPD Provider Handbook* is required.
- **Expected outcome:**
  - Reaccreditation: Accreditation is renewed from the original expiry date up to the standard accreditation period, subject to satisfactory review.
  - Deviation: The deviation is granted for the activity up until the existing expiry date, subject to satisfactory review.
- **Proposed fee:** A fee that is equivalent to that of a new application.

### 3. Criteria for determining review banding

The table below sets out criteria for each banding. Where changes have been made to more than one component, the banding for the reaccreditation or deviation application as a whole may be subject to change (Section 4).

Component of activity	Minor (deviation – notification only)	Intermediate (deviation with review)	Major (full reaccreditation required)
<b>Activity details (title, dates, location, format, duration, target audience)</b>	Change to delivery dates or venue/location. Minor wording corrections (e.g. typos) that do not change meaning or clinical intent.	Change in delivery format (e.g. face-to-face to live webinar) with minimal impact on how outcomes are achieved. Minor change to duration that does not affect the CPD points grouping or allocation.	Change to the intended target audience. Significant change to format or duration that affects how learning outcomes are achieved or the CPD points grouping or allocation.
<b>Learning outcomes and Competency Standard mapping</b>	Correction of spelling, grammar or formatting. Reordering of outcomes without changing their meaning.	Rewording of outcomes for clarity or to align with updated terminology, where the scope and intent remain unchanged. Addition or deletion of a mapped Competency Standard.	Addition, removal or substantive rewording of outcomes that changes the scope, intent or level of the activity (e.g. from ‘recognise’ to ‘demonstrate’). Significant changes to mapped Competency Standards.
<b>Activity content and design</b>	Correction of typographical or formatting errors. Updates to logos or contact details.	Addition or removal of content sections, examples or case studies that do not change the learning outcomes. Minor adjustments to sequencing or presentation.	Substantial redesign of the activity (e.g. lecture to workshop). Changes to content that affect alignment with the stated learning outcomes.
<b>Evidence base, guidelines and regulatory alignment</b>	No material change to the underlying evidence base, clinical guidelines, legislation or scope of practice since the previous accreditation.	Minor updates to references, clinical guidelines or resources cited, where the activity’s recommendations, scope and conclusions remain unchanged.	Material change to clinical guidelines, legislation, scope of practice that may affect the accuracy, currency or continued relevance of the activity’s content.
<b>Presenter, contributor or author</b>	Replacement of a presenter, contributor or author with a person of equivalent qualifications and expertise and without a conflict of interest that may impact activity delivery.	Change of presenter, contributor or author where the new person’s expertise differs to some extent from the original (e.g. a related but different speciality).	New presenter, contributor or author has a declared conflict of interest, or expertise that is significantly different to the original.

Component of activity	Minor (deviation – notification only)	Intermediate (deviation with review)	Major (full reaccreditation required)
<b>Assessment and evaluation</b>	Correction of spelling, formatting or numbering errors in assessment questions. No change to question content, number, or pass mark.	Change in the number or format of assessment questions (e.g. additional MCQs) that does not change how the learning outcomes are assessed.	Removal of assessment, or redesign of the assessment approach (e.g. from MCQ to OSCE, case-based or reflective assessment), or changes affecting alignment between assessment and outcomes.
<b>Sponsorship, funding and declared interests</b>	No change to funding source(s) or sponsorship arrangements. Routine updates to standard disclosure wording.	New sponsor or funding source added, where there is no influence over educational content and disclosures are updated accordingly.	New or changed commercial relationship with potential to influence content, or a conflict of interest that was not previously declared or managed.
<b>Administrative and learner support</b>	Administrative updates such as contact details or registration links.	Change to the learner support model (e.g. change to feedback mechanisms, communication channels, learning management system) or CPD provider (only where the quality or accessibility of the activity is not impacted).	Significant reduction in learner support, or change of CPD provider, platform or model that may impact the quality or accessibility of the activity.

## 4. Cumulative changes and assessor discretion

The criteria in Section 3 are intended as a guide to the typical scope of changes associated with each banding. They are not an exhaustive list, and the PSA Accredited CPD team will assess each reaccreditation or deviation application on a case-by-case basis.

### 4.1 Cumulative changes

Where each individual change notified by a CPD provider would, considered in isolation, fall within the Minor or Intermediate criteria, the combined effect of multiple changes may mean the activity has changed sufficiently to warrant a higher banding or full assessment. This is at the discretion of the PSA Accredited CPD team.

### 4.2 Assessor discretion

There may be circumstances where a change that would typically fall within the Minor or Intermediate criteria raises a concern about the activity's continued alignment with the *PSA Standards for Continuing Professional Development for Pharmacists*, in which case the PSA Accredited CPD team or assessor may determine that a higher banding applies. This will be communicated to the CPD provider as part of the reaccreditation or deviation assessment process.

## 5. Fees

	Reaccreditation and deviation fee banding		
CPD duration	Minor	Intermediate	Major
<1 hour	\$150 (ex GST) \$165 (inc GST)	\$275 (ex GST) \$302.50 (inc GST)	\$550 (ex GST) \$605 (inc GST)
1-2 hours	\$150 (ex GST) \$165 (inc GST)	\$350 (ex GST) \$385 (inc GST)	\$700 (ex GST) \$770 (inc GST)
2-4 hours	\$150 (ex GST) \$165 (inc GST)	\$650 (ex GST) \$715 (inc GST)	\$1300 (ex GST) \$1430 (inc GST)
4-6 hours	\$150 (ex GST) \$165 (inc GST)	\$925 (ex GST) \$1017.50 (inc GST)	\$1850 (ex GST) \$2035 (inc GST)
>1 day	\$150 (ex GST) \$165 (inc GST)	POA	POA

## 6. Submission process

1. The CPD provider reviews the criteria at Section 3 and identifies any changes proposed for the activity since it was last accredited.
2. The CPD provider submits a reaccreditation application or deviation application using the relevant form available on at <https://www.psa.org.au/cpd/cpd-accreditation/>, including updated activity materials and associated documentation.
3. The PSA Accredited CPD team reviews the application and assigns the banding that applies, based on the criteria in Section 3 and the considerations in Section 4.
4. Where the banding is confirmed as Minor or Intermediate, the CPD provider is informed of the fee payable, and the activity review is undertaken upon acceptance of the quoted fee by the CPD provider.
5. Where the banding is confirmed as Major, or where the PSA Accredited CPD team determines that escalation is required as described in Section 4, the CPD provider is notified and invited to submit a full accreditation application.
6. On satisfactory completion of the review, the activity's accreditation is renewed for up to 2 years from the relevant date, and the CPD provider is issued with updated confirmation of accreditation of their CPD activity. In the case of a deviation, where the application is successful, the CPD provider may deliver the updated version of the CPD activity to the end of its accreditation period.