**NCPMC Accreditation Standards**

**Program Accreditation Review Checklist**

**Program under evaluation: District of Columbia Date: August 2019**

**Evaluator’s Name: Jan Sims**

**Evaluator’s Role:** [x]  **Review Committee Chair** [ ]  **CPM Graduate** [ ]  **CPM Instructor**

**Standard 1: Mission and Public Service**

The program has a program specific mission statement? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

Does it guide public service performance expectations? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

Is there a method of program operations and performance evaluation? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

Evaluator’s Comments:

How well the program meets Standard 1 concerning Mission and Public Service is measured through the behavior and career trajecdory of alumni and current participants. Meetings with participants, alumni, faculty/instructors, Advisory Board members, and the HR Director for the District of Columbia confirmed that CPM participants are sought after by agencies in the District because of the highly esteemed reputation of the program. The CPM program is recognized as a valuable resource for turning high potential employees into highly effective public sector managers.

Items of Note:

Each cohort creates a Code of Ethics which becomes their standard for interacting with one another and the agency(ies) that host their capstone project.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

No suggestions for improvement.

**1.1 Mission Statement. Evidence could include but is not limited to:** mission statement, interviews with stakeholders about development and implementation of the mission statement and about use of the mission statement to set priorities, develop programs and curricula, establish learning outcomes, and allocate resources.

**1.2 Performance Expectations. Evidence could include but is not limited to:** Review of brochures, handbooks, flyers, website information; planning documents; logic models and environmental scans; and interviews with stakeholders to discuss expectations for alignment of the mission and goals with the program.

**1.3 Program Evaluation. Evidence could include but is not limited to:** The most recent Annual Report; evaluations of the program; survey results from alumni, employers, and focus groups; and Interviews with stakeholders about program improvement processes and about improvements to the program.

**The program adequately meets Standard 1: Mission and Public Service** [x]  **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? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

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

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

Does the public management project benefit their organization? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

Evaluator’s Comments:

The program is built around the 7 NCPMC competencies for CPM programs, as provided in attachment 3.1 Course Competency Map. The program consists of 350+ hours, as provided in attachment 3.3 Course Contact Hour Map. The capstone project contains a written component (samples included in Accreditation Notebook) and the project definitely benefits agencies in the District (benefits to agencies included in Accreditation Notebook attached materials 3.5, 3.6, 3.13, and 3.14).

Items of Note:

A copy of an online exam was included in the Accreditation Notebook, along with many of the examples of evidence mentioned in the Program Accreditation Review Checklist, 2.0 – 2.2.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

No suggestions for improvement.

**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** [x]  **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? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

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

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

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

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

Evaluator’s Comments:

Toured the physical facility at DCHR; observed cohort preparing for project presentations in GWU classroom; interviewed instructors and read instructor bio’s in Accreditation Notebook to confirm expertise; interviewed members of Advisory Board; confirmed budgetary resources as provided in Accreditation Notebook attachment 1.3; applications for selection in each cohort far exceed the number of participants selected, ensuring demand for future cohorts.

Items of Note:

During site visit, meetings were held with current cohort, alumni, faculty/instructors, Advisory Board members, HR director for the District of Columbia, and program director/program manager. Toured facility at DCHR as well as GWU campus. Questions were encouraged, and all questions were answered confirming the resources and capacity of the program exceed the needs of the program.

The CPM instructor on the Continuing Accreditation Team noted the statement in the Student Handbook that participants who do not remain employed with the District government for two years following program completion must repay the District government its portion of the program costs. This was discussed during the site visit, and processes are in place at DCHR for enforcing this requirement.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

No suggestions for improvement.

**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** [x]  **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? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

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

Are participant records held securely and confidentially? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

Are assessment review standards clearly specified? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

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

Evaluator’s Comments:

Accreditation Notebook Tab 3 discussed the reasons for the area of the greatest change since the last continuing accreditation – the curriculum change from Lean Six Sigma to Strategic Project Management. It is clear there is in place an ongoing, participatory planning process to ensure the continued relevance of the program.

Items of Note:

Lean Six Sigma curriculum dominated more than 50% of the modules prior to 2016. Even though the curriculum was relevant, it required a significant amount of time. The change to strategic project management allowed for a greater emphasis on public management and leadership, including the ability to offer individual coaching sessions for participants. The participants find great value in the coaching sessions and peer learning circles, and would even like them to be expanded.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

No suggestions for improvement.

**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** [x]  **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? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

Does the program invite participant evaluation of classes? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

Does the program evaluate assessment outcomes to improve the program? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

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

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

Evaluator’s Comments:

Examples of evaluations were provided in the Accreditation Notebook. A culture of continuous improvement exists in the partnership between DCHR and GWU-CEPL, from faculty/instructors, and from cohort participants.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

No suggestions for improvement.

**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** [x]  **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.

[x]  **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 Review Team would like to mention three things we find particularly effective about the program:

1. The application process for admittance into the program sets high expectations for participants, and attracts District employees who demonstrate high potential for their employing agencies.
2. The focus on strategic project management develops transferrable skills that elevate public sector performance from a transactional focus to a transformational one.
3. The structure of the project selection/project team format that meets with the host agency(ies) over a period of more than six months provides experience in project management beyond the classroom. The structure embodies experiential learning that develops key skills needed in 21st century public sector agencies.

Any other comments or concerns?

There once was a networking society of graduates, but the graduates continually relied on the CPM program manager to plan and fund society functions. This type of funding is beyond the scope of a CPM program. In the focus group with alumni during the site visit, Jan encouraged the alumni to coordinate a society among themselves, confirming that in other states such a society exists independently of the CPM program. The alumni present seemed to be open to coordinating a society of graduates in the future.