

INITIAL ACCREDITATION REPORT
ON
THE MINNESOTA CERTIFIED PUBLIC MANAGER PROGRAM

Presented to:

The National Certified Public Manager Consortium

By the Review committee:

Dr, Ann Cotten, Chair
Dr. Marci Porter Campbell, CPM Instructor
Cory Thomas, MBA, CPM, CPM Graduate

September, 2021

We, the members of the committee appointed to review the Minnesota Certified Public Manger program for initial accreditation are pleased to report we have completed our review and recommend, without qualifications, that the Minnesota CPM program be accredited for the maximum period authorized by the bylaws. Our recommendation is based on the following findings:

Findings

1. Minnesota program administrators submitted all required program documentation to each of the review committee membership;
2. After review by committee members all supplemental documentation was provided on a timely basis;
3. In the matter of general program requirements, the committee determined that:
 - A. Adequate linkages exist with institutions of higher education;
 - B. An advisory board is actively involved in dealing with appropriate program issues;
 - C. The program, markets actively to local government customers;
 - D. Program requirements are clear and accessible to all applicants and candidates. *[Note, some portions of the curriculum are still under development since this is the first cycle of the program.]*
4. In the matter of program organization, we find:
 - A. Adequate financial support exists from a combination of institutional support and program fees;
 - B. Program instruction is provided by a combination of well qualified MPA faculty, practitioner adjunct faculty, and guest speakers.
5. We find thorough documentation of administrative policies and procedures in a combination of administrative policy and formal regulations.

We further find:

- A. A formal manual tracking system is in place;
- B. Adequate security exists for student records;

- C. Evaluations of student learning is based upon a series of written assignments and the capstone project. Students receive a letter grade at the completion of each of the four units.
6. In the matter of course, materials we find:
- A. Courses provided are balanced to adequately cover the required competencies;
 - B. Course syllabi that include learning objectives exist for each course offered thus far;
 - C. The program, while responsive to the competencies, is well integrated;
 - D. Clear policies regarding substitutions are in place;
 - E. All requirements regarding hours of instruction are met.
7. In regard to program evaluation, we find:
- A. Each course is adequately evaluated by students;
 - B. Each instructor is adequately evaluated by students;
 - C. The program director and faculty make real-time modifications to the program in response to student feedback.
8. We examined a detailed list of candidates in the program.
9. We discussed the program's perceived strengths and weaknesses. We are impressed by the efforts to address areas needing improvement, especially:
- A. **Adjusting the program based upon participant evaluations and feedback.** The faculty and program director are adjusting the program as it is being delivered based upon participant feedback and evaluations. Specifically, additional real-time virtual sessions were added at the request of the participants
 - B. **Adding outside speakers.** Participants appreciated the addition of outside speakers to the program.
 - C. **Plans to expand recruitment.** The program leadership has created an advisory board with strong connections with Minnesota's public sector. The director and advisory board are developing plans to expand recruitment for the

10. The committee recommends the program review and consider examining the program in the following areas:
- A. **Review mix of synchronous and asynchronous instruction.** The Minnesota program is blended with in-person residencies and asynchronous online instruction. In response to participant feedback, the instructors have added some live Zoom discussions to the program. The program should consider ways to increase the proportion of the program that is delivered live, even if the additional live sessions are virtual instead of in-person. Participants want to connect more with each other and faculty through live discussion instead of online discussion boards.
 - B. **Review the mix of course materials** with an eye toward selecting materials that are less academic and more practitioner focused when possible. Where possible, provide current materials.
 - C. **Review course content and update material.** Participants noted that some course content seemed dated. In situations where ‘dated’ material reflects seminal work, it would be helpful to inform participants. Otherwise, material should be updated regularly.
 - D. **Consider adding more practitioners as instructors and guest speakers.** Participants appreciated having an instructor who was also a current city manager. Participants valued the instructor’s ability to related to their situation.
 - E. **Provide more detailed information about course.** Participants would like more detailed information about assignments and due dates at the beginning of the program.
 - F. **Consider creating workbooks for modules two – three.** The workbook developed for the leadership module was valued highly by the participants. Participants recommended creating similar workbooks for the remaining modules.
 - G. **Better document program costs.** The program is highly subsidized by its home institution. The committee recommends that the program develop a more detailed budget to better understand the total cost of the program in preparation for the time when the program must be completely self-supporting.

The program has many strong points. We were especially impressed by:

- A. Reputation:** Hamline University, the Hamline MPA program, and the Hamline Center for Public Administration and Leadership have a reputation for excellence in preparing individuals for public service in the Minnesota. The CPM program is closely affiliated with the MPA program. The CPM program director and one of the primary instructors are MPA faculty members and another CPM instructor is an adjunct in the MPA program.

The linkage between the CPM program and the MPA program and CPAL lends instant credibility to the CPM Program.

Hamline University has a strong alumni network and everyone involved with the program from the advisory board, to the instructors, and the students are very proud of their affiliation with the institution and want to help it succeed.

- B. Institutional Support:** The Minnesota CPM program benefits from strong institutional support. Interviews with the Interim Dean and Assistant Dean confirmed support for the program. The institution allows two faculty members to teach in the CPM program “on load” which reduces the administrative cost to the program. The leadership has realistic expectations for how long it will take the program to be self-supporting. Additionally, the Minnesota CPM program is not charged indirect or other support fees.
- C. Strong Administrative Support:** By being located in the Center for Public Administration and Leadership, the Minnesota CPM benefits from the center’s expertise in delivering professional development programs, from the administrative infrastructure, and existing processes.
- D. Institutional Review and Approval Process:** Before the program was offered, the Minnesota CPM program went through a rigorous review process. The Minnesota CPM program was reviewed and approved internally at Hamline University by the Hamline School of Business Graduate Curriculum and Assessment Committee and then approved by the faculty. Once faculty approval was secured, the CPM Certificate program was then reviewed and approved by the Minnesota Office of Higher Education and the Higher Learning Commission.
- E. Engaged, Connected Advisory Board:** The members of the advisory board represent key constituencies and markets for the CPM program. Most board members are Hamline MPA or DPA graduates or faculty members. All expressed interest in working to recruit participants into the

program and to support the program as speakers, reviewers, and mentors to participants.

- F. **Leadership Workbook:** One of the adjunct faculty members developed an outstanding workbook for the leadership portion of the program. The workbook included a variety of exercises and self-assessments that allowed the students to apply what they were learning in the class to their situation. Program participants found the workbook to be informative and very engaging. The participants plan to keep the workbook as a professional reference tool throughout their careers.

- G. **Clifton Strengths Finder:** The incorporation of the Clifton Strengths Finder into the curriculum is seen as a best practice. The program participants found the tool and its application to quite useful. Some members have already started using Strengths Finder with their staff members.

- H. **In Person Residencies:** The Minnesota program is offered in a hybrid format with in-person residencies at the beginning and end of each of the four modules. The program participants valued the discussions and networking during in-person residency.

- I. **Academic Credit for Completion:** Successful completers can earn 12 credits toward a Hamline MPA degree. Participants do not have to pay an extra fee to earn the credits.

The graduate credits are a great incentive to encourage public managers to complete their MPA degree and are one more demonstration of the strong linkage between the CPM program and the MPA program.

The findings and recommendations are based on a review of all documentation by the committee and confirmed by a site visit by the chair on [Month/dates, year].

Committee Recommendation:

Accredit **XX** Accredit Provisionally Not Accredit

If either accredit provisionally or not accredit, please specify reasons or reference the relevant paragraph in the report.

Recommendation endorsed by consensus of the committee and respectfully submitted by:

Dr. Marci Porter Campbell, Instructor Reviewer

Cory Thomas, MBA, CPM, CPM Graduate Reviewer

And

Ann Cotten
Dr. Ann Cotten, Chair, for the Committee

September 30, 2021
Date

and Interviews with stakeholders about program improvement processes and about improvements to the program.

The program adequately meets Standard 1: Mission and Public Service Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Standard 2: Core Competencies

Are the CPM Core Competencies adequately addressed across the curriculum? Yes No

Does the program consist of 300 or more hours of structured learning activities? Yes No

Does the program have a public management project (capstone) that includes a written component? Yes No

Does the public management project benefit their organization? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

The core competencies are addressed in the curriculum, the curriculum meets the 300 hour requirement, and the capstone project is designed to benefit the organization.

Items of Note:

The participants raved about the leadership workbook developed by one of the instructors.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

- A. **Review mix of synchronous and asynchronous instruction.** The Minnesota program is blended with in-person residencies and asynchronous online instruction. In response to participant feedback, the instructors have added some live Zoom discussions to the program. The program should consider ways to increase the proportion of the program that is delivered live, even if the additional live sessions are virtual instead of in-person. Participants want to connect more with each other and faculty through live discussion instead of online discussion boards.
- B. **Review the mix of course materials** with an eye toward selecting materials that are less academic and more practitioner focused when possible. Where possible, provide current materials.
- C. **Review course content and update material.** Participants noted that some course content seemed dated. In situations where 'dated' material reflects seminal work, it would be helpful to inform participants. Otherwise, material should be updated regularly.

- D. **Consider adding more practitioners as instructors and guest speakers.** Participants appreciated having an instructor who was also a current city manager. Participants valued the instructor's ability to relate to their situation.
- E. **Provide more detailed information about course.** Participants would like more detailed information about assignments and due dates at the beginning of the program.
- F. **Consider creating workbooks for modules two – three.** The workbook developed for the leadership module was valued highly by the participants. Participants recommended creating similar workbooks for the remaining modules.

2.0 Core Competencies. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Documentation of core curriculum and learning outcomes and of core curriculum and competencies; sample capstone projects; policies and procedures; brochures; handbooks; flyers, website information; interviews with stakeholders—participants, Faculty/Instructors, employers about the curriculum.

2.1 Competencies Addressed in Curriculum. Evidence could include but is not limited to: brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information; policies and procedures; sample capstone projects; sample assessments, evaluations and, tests; interviews with stakeholders.

2.2 Examinations and Projects. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Sample capstone projects, assessments and tests; policies and procedures manual; interviews with alumni who submitted exceptional projects (possibly Askew Award winners).

The program adequately meets Standard 2: Core Competencies Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Standard 3: Resources and Capacity

Does the program adequately document the adequacy of its resources and capacity to fulfill its mission? Yes No

Does the program have policies and procedures that promote effective management and operation of the program in a sustainable manner? Yes No

Do the policies provide guidance linking administrative procedures to the mission? Yes No

Does the program utilize instructors who can demonstrate academic or professional experience to be qualified for the content they teach? Yes No

Does the program have a governing or advisory group guiding policy, recommendations, and potential clientele?

 Yes

 No

Evaluator's Comments:

The program enjoys significant financial support from its home institution. Two of the program faculty are teaching in the program "on-load" significantly decreasing the instructional cost of the program. The program is not required to pay indirect cost to the institution and is not charged for support services. The leadership of the college is very supportive of the program and has reasonable expectations for how long it will take for the program to become profitable.

Items of Note:

The program developed an excellent workbook for Module 1 on leadership skills.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

The program should consider maintaining better records about the actual cost of program delivery even if the program is significantly subsidized.

3.0 Program Resources. Evidence could include but is not limited to Documentation of resources showing alignment with the mission, goals, objectives and outcomes, for example, a Logic Model. Tour of the physical facility, budget documentation, brochures, website etc., interviews with participants and Faculty/Instructors about the adequacy of resources and capacity.

3.1 Administrative Infrastructure. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Policies and procedures; interviews with institutional and program leadership; observation of modalities used in the program (for example, access to on-line platform and/or observation of a classroom)

3.2 Faculty/Instructors. Evidence could include but is not limited to Documentation of Faculty/Instructors, including name, address and area of expertise (A list of the Faculty/Instructors and their bios is available); brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information.

3.3 Administrative Policies and Procedures. Evidence could include but is not limited to flyers, brochures, website and policies and procedures manual; confidentiality statement.

3.4 Funding. Evidence could include but is not limited to: documented budget; interviews with both institutional and program leadership. A copy of the budget will be available for review.

3.5 Advisory Group. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Documentation of advisory board members/group and their meetings, including name, address and area of expertise;

brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information, interviews with advisory board/group members.

The program adequately meets Standard 3: Resources and Capacity Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Standard 4: Planning and Implementation

Does the program engage in ongoing, participatory planning that provides direction for the institution and leads to the achievement of intended outcomes for programs and services? Yes No

Are the program's planning and implementation processes sufficiently flexible to address unexpected circumstances while maintaining the program's rigor and viability? Yes No

Are participant records held securely and confidentially? Yes No

Are assessment review standards clearly specified? Yes No

Are evaluation results taken into consideration for program improvements? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

Before the program was offered, the Minnesota CPM program went through a rigorous review process. The Minnesota CPM program was reviewed and approved internally at Hamline University by the Hamline School of Business Graduate Curriculum and Assessment Committee and then approved by the faculty. Once faculty approval was secured, the CPM Certificate program was then reviewed and approved by the Minnesota Office of Higher Education and the Higher Learning Commission.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

The program should consider using Canvas to track attendance and grades. Recording attendance and grades off line is not an issue when the program is small and there is continuity in instructors and leadership. However as the program grows, it will be important to maintain these records in Canvas or the LMS.

4.0 Planning and Implementation. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Strategic plan; frequency or cycle of planning; flexibility of planning and implementation; documentation of curriculum; survey results; interviews with stakeholders

4.1 (3.5) Program Requirements. Evidence could include but is not limited to: brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information, samples of correspondence between program and applicants

4.2 Tracking System. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Observations of tracking/filing system/s; samples of correspondence with participants about their progress; interviews with current participants of the program.

4.3 Security Measures. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Observation and review of how participant files and evaluations are secured; policies and procedures

4.4 Assessment. Evidence could include but is not limited to: sample assessment reviews and evaluations; policies and procedures; interviews with stakeholders.

The program adequately meets Standard 4: Planning and Implementation Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Standard 5: Effectiveness and Improvement

Does the program assess how well the participants are meeting the expectations of the Faculty/Instructors? Yes No

Does the program invite participant evaluation of classes? Yes No

Does the program evaluate assessment outcomes to improve the program? Yes No

Does the program demonstrate and implement a plan of appropriate strategic growth? Yes No

Does the program promote a culture of continuous improvement processes? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Items of Note:

Since this is the initial year of the program, evaluation data and their use are limited. The program does collect formal and informal participant feedback and has made modifications to the program based upon that feedback. Specifically, scynchronous online discussion sessions were added at the request of the participants.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

5.1 Participants' Reactions. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Sample assessments; evaluations and interviews with stakeholders including participants, Faculty/Instructors, and employers

5.2 Program Development. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Interviews with stakeholders; documented changes in curriculum and strategic plan

5.3 Areas of Growth. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Strategic plan; documented changes resulting from a continuous improvement process; interviews with program stakeholders

The program adequately meets Standard 5: Effectiveness and Improvement Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

In Conclusion

After careful review, I find the program adequately meets the NCPMC Standards for accreditation and would recommend accreditation of this program to the NCPMC Executive Council.

Yes Conditionally Yes No

If "Conditionally Yes", what conditions would you propose for consideration by the NCPMC Executive Council?

Click or tap here to enter text.

What did you find particularly effective or remarkable about this program that other programs might wish to emulate?

1. Course workbook. An instructor developed a comprehensive course workbook for the leadership module of the program. Participants found the workbook to be very helpful and several commented that they see it as a document they will keep for their professional career.

Any other comments or concerns?

No.

and Interviews with stakeholders about program improvement processes and about improvements to the program.

The program adequately meets Standard 1: Mission and Public Service Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Standard 2: Core Competencies

Are the CPM Core Competencies adequately addressed across the curriculum? Yes No

Does the program consist of 300 or more hours of structured learning activities? Yes No

Does the program have a public management project (capstone) that includes a written component? Yes No

Does the public management project benefit their organization? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

I believe this standard is easily met.

Items of Note:

The workbook is a great tool for students. There are synchronous and asynchronous material.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

2.0 Core Competencies. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Documentation of core curriculum and learning outcomes and of core curriculum and competencies; sample capstone projects; policies and procedures; brochures; handbooks; flyers, website information; interviews with stakeholders—participants, Faculty/Instructors, employers about the curriculum.

2.1 Competencies Addressed in Curriculum. Evidence could include but is not limited to: brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information; policies and procedures; sample capstone projects; sample assessments, evaluations and, tests; interviews with stakeholders.

2.2 Examinations and Projects. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Sample capstone projects, assessments and tests; policies and procedures manual; interviews with alumni who submitted exceptional projects (possibly Askew Award winners).

The program adequately meets Standard 2: Core Competencies Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Standard 3: Resources and Capacity

- | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Does the program adequately document the adequacy of its resources and capacity to fulfill its mission? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Does the program have policies and procedures that promote effective management and operation of the program in a sustainable manner? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Do the policies provide guidance linking administrative procedures to the mission? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Does the program utilize instructors who can demonstrate academic or professional experience to be qualified for the content they teach? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Does the program have a governing or advisory group guiding policy, recommendations, and potential clientele? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Evaluator's Comments:

My only concern here is that there are only five participants in the program. Will it be able to be a self-sustaining program? Is that a requirement or can it be subsidized? The advisory committee seems very committed to the program and its success. It is impressive that students get 12 hours of master's level credit for CPM with no additional tuition/fees.

Items of Note:

It is impressive that students get 12 hours of master's level credit for CPM with no additional tuition/fees

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

I would have liked to see a budget with total costs including books, assessments, etc. In addition, a break even point should provide a target for the number of participants in a cohort.

3.0 Program Resources. Evidence could include but is not limited to Documentation of resources showing alignment with the mission, goals, objectives and outcomes, for example, a Logic Model. Tour of the physical facility, budget documentation, brochures, website etc., interviews with participants and Faculty/Instructors about the adequacy of resources and capacity.

3.1 Administrative Infrastructure. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Policies and procedures; interviews with institutional and program leadership; observation of modalities used in the program (for example, access to on-line platform and/or observation of a classroom)

3.2 Faculty/Instructors. Evidence could include but is not limited to Documentation of Faculty/Instructors, including name, address and area of expertise (A list of the Faculty/Instructors and their bios is available); brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information.

3.3 Administrative Policies and Procedures. Evidence could include but is not limited to flyers, brochures, website and policies and procedures manual; confidentiality statement.

3.4 Funding. Evidence could include but is not limited to: documented budget; interviews with both institutional and program leadership. A copy of the budget will be available for review.

3.5 Advisory Group. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Documentation of advisory board members/group and their meetings, including name, address and area of expertise; brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information, interviews with advisory board/group members.

The program adequately meets Standard 3: Resources and Capacity Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Standard 4: Planning and Implementation

Does the program engage in ongoing, participatory planning that provides direction for the institution and leads to the achievement of intended outcomes for programs and services? Yes No

Are the program's planning and implementation processes sufficiently flexible to address unexpected circumstances while maintaining the program's rigor and viability? Yes No

Are participant records held securely and confidentially? Yes No

Are assessment review standards clearly specified? Yes No

Are evaluation results taken into consideration for program improvements? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

Evaluations are completed after every module and reviewed for improvement.

Items of Note:

Evaluations are conducted often enough to allow for improvements during the program.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

4.0 Planning and Implementation. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Strategic plan; frequency or cycle of planning; flexibility of planning and implementation; documentation of curriculum; survey results; interviews with stakeholders

4.1 (3.5) Program Requirements. Evidence could include but is not limited to: brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information, samples of correspondence between program and applicants

4.2 Tracking System. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Observations of tracking/filing system/s; samples of correspondence with participants about their progress; interviews with current participants of the program.

4.3 Security Measures. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Observation and review of how participant files and evaluations are secured; policies and procedures

4.4 Assessment. Evidence could include but is not limited to: sample assessment reviews and evaluations; policies and procedures; interviews with stakeholders.

The program adequately meets Standard 4: Planning and Implementation Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Standard 5: Effectiveness and Improvement
--

Does the program assess how well the participants are meeting the expectations of the Faculty/Instructors? Yes No

Does the program invite participant evaluation of classes? Yes No

Does the program evaluate assessment outcomes to improve the program? Yes No

Does the program demonstrate and implement a plan of appropriate strategic growth? Yes No

Does the program promote a culture of continuous improvement processes? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

Participants evaluate modules.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

I am not sure I saw a strategic plan for growth.

5.1 Participants' Reactions. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Sample assessments; evaluations and interviews with stakeholders including participants, Faculty/Instructors, and employers

5.2 Program Development. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Interviews with stakeholders; documented changes in curriculum and strategic plan

5.3 Areas of Growth. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Strategic plan; documented changes resulting from a continuous improvement process; interviews with program stakeholders

The program adequately meets Standard 5: Effectiveness and Improvement Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

In Conclusion

After careful review, I find the program adequately meets the NCPMC Standards for accreditation and would recommend accreditation of this program to the NCPMC Executive Council.

Yes Conditionally Yes No

If "Conditionally Yes", what conditions would you propose for consideration by the NCPMC Executive Council?

Click or tap here to enter text.

What did you find particularly effective or remarkable about this program that other programs might wish to emulate?

The Workbook! It provided the students with a roadmap of the class and an opportunity for them to see their development over the course of the program. The commitment of the advisory committee was impressive; really good connections for marketing and sustainability.

Any other comments or concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

The program adequately meets Standard 1: Mission and Public Service Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Standard 2: Core Competencies

Are the CPM Core Competencies adequately addressed across the curriculum? Yes No

Does the program consist of 300 or more hours of structured learning activities? Yes No

Does the program have a public management project (capstone) that includes a written component? Yes No

Does the public management project benefit their organization? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

2.0 Core Competencies. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Documentation of core curriculum and learning outcomes and of core curriculum and competencies; sample capstone projects; policies and procedures; brochures; handbooks; flyers, website information; interviews with stakeholders—participants, Faculty/Instructors, employers about the curriculum.

2.1 Competencies Addressed in Curriculum. Evidence could include but is not limited to: brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information; policies and procedures; sample capstone projects; sample assessments, evaluations and, tests; interviews with stakeholders.

2.2 Examinations and Projects. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Sample capstone projects, assessments and tests; policies and procedures manual; interviews with alumni who submitted exceptional projects (possibly Askew Award winners).

The program adequately meets Standard 2: Core Competencies Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Standard 3: Resources and Capacity

Does the program adequately document the adequacy of its resources and capacity to fulfill its mission? Yes No

Does the program have policies and procedures that promote effective management and operation of the program in a sustainable manner? Yes No

Do the policies provide guidance linking administrative procedures to the mission? Yes No

Does the program utilize instructors who can demonstrate academic or professional experience to be qualified for the content they teach? Yes No

Does the program have a governing or advisory group guiding policy, recommendations, and potential clientele? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

Hamline is very committed to their program and has assembled a network of good supportive partners to ensure the success of the CPM program.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

3.0 Program Resources. Evidence could include but is not limited to Documentation of resources showing alignment with the mission, goals, objectives and outcomes, for example, a Logic Model. Tour of the physical facility, budget documentation, brochures, website etc., interviews with participants and Faculty/Instructors about the adequacy of resources and capacity.

3.1 Administrative Infrastructure. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Policies and procedures; interviews with institutional and program leadership; observation of modalities used in the program (for example, access to on-line platform and/or observation of a classroom)

3.2 Faculty/Instructors. Evidence could include but is not limited to Documentation of Faculty/Instructors, including name, address and area of expertise (A list of the Faculty/Instructors and their bios is available); brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information.

3.3 Administrative Policies and Procedures. Evidence could include but is not limited to flyers, brochures, website and policies and procedures manual; confidentiality statement.

3.4 Funding. Evidence could include but is not limited to: documented budget; interviews with both institutional and program leadership. A copy of the budget will be available for review.

3.5 Advisory Group. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Documentation of advisory board members/group and their meetings, including name, address and area of expertise; brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information, interviews with advisory board/group members.

The program adequately meets Standard 3: Resources and Capacity Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Standard 4: Planning and Implementation

Does the program engage in ongoing, participatory planning that provides direction for the institution and leads to the achievement of intended outcomes for programs and services? Yes No

Are the program's planning and implementation processes sufficiently flexible to address unexpected circumstances while maintaining the program's rigor and viability? Yes No

Are participant records held securely and confidentially? Yes No

Are assessment review standards clearly specified? Yes No

Are evaluation results taken into consideration for program improvements? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Items of Note:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

4.0 Planning and Implementation. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Strategic plan; frequency or cycle of planning; flexibility of planning and implementation; documentation of curriculum; survey results; interviews with stakeholders

4.1 (3.5) Program Requirements. Evidence could include but is not limited to: brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information, samples of correspondence between program and applicants

4.2 Tracking System. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Observations of tracking/filing system/s; samples of correspondence with participants about their progress; interviews with current participants of the program.

4.3 Security Measures. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Observation and review of how participant files and evaluations are secured; policies and procedures

4.4 Assessment. Evidence could include but is not limited to: sample assessment reviews and evaluations; policies and procedures; interviews with stakeholders.

The program adequately meets Standard 4: Planning and Implementation Yes No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Standard 5: Effectiveness and Improvement

Does the program assess how well the participants are meeting the expectations of the Faculty/Instructors? Yes No

Does the program invite participant evaluation of classes? Yes No

Does the program evaluate assessment outcomes to improve the program? Yes No

Does the program demonstrate and implement a plan of appropriate strategic growth? Yes No

Does the program promote a culture of continuous improvement processes? Yes No

Evaluator's Comments:

The interviews indicated that this is a work in progress and they are extremely open to modifications to enhance/improve for the future.

Items of Note:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

5.1 Participants' Reactions. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Sample assessments; evaluations and interviews with stakeholders including participants, Faculty/Instructors, and employers

5.2 Program Development. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Interviews with stakeholders; documented changes in curriculum and strategic plan

5.3 Areas of Growth. Evidence could include but is not limited to: Strategic plan; documented changes resulting from a continuous improvement process; interviews with program stakeholders

The program adequately meets Standard 5: Effectiveness and Improvement **Yes** **No**

If no, then please explain your concern here:

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

In Conclusion

After careful review, I find the program adequately meets the NCPMC Standards for accreditation and would recommend accreditation of this program to the NCPMC Executive Council.

Yes **Conditionally Yes** **No**

If "Conditionally Yes", what conditions would you propose for consideration by the NCPMC Executive Council?

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

What did you find particularly effective or remarkable about this program that other programs might wish to emulate?

Overall commitment from all partners and the University. They are committed to making this work and be a class act program.

Any other comments or concerns?

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)