

CONTINUING ACCREDITATION REPORT  
ON  
THE GEORGIA CERTIFIED PUBLIC MANAGER PROGRAM

Presented to:

The National Certified Public Manager Consortium

By the Review committee:

Dr. Ann Cotten, Chair  
Lance Noe, CPM Instructor  
Colleen Clark, CPM Graduate

September 2023

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

#### Findings

1. Georgia program administrators submitted all required program documentation to members of the review committee;
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. The advisory board is actively and appropriately involved with the program;
  - C. The program markets to state and local governments clients; and
  - D. Program requirements are clear and accessible to all applicants and candidates.
4. In the matter of program organization, we find:
  - A. Adequate financial support exists from program fees;
  - B. The program is housed in the Carl Vinson Institute, one of the top university public service organizations in the country; and
  - C. Program instruction is provided by well qualified instructors from the Institute of Government;
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 learning management system is in place to tack participant progress to program completion.
- B. Project requirements are clear;

- C. Group service learning projects are one of the strengths of the program;
  - D. Adequate security exists for student records; and
  - E. Student evaluations are based on a series of formal [tests/assessments].
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;
  - C. A well designed, well integrated program;
  - D. Clear policies regarding substitutions are in place; and
  - E. All requirements regarding hours of instruction are met.
7. In regard to program evaluation we find:
- A. The program is adequately evaluated by students;
  - B. Each instructor is adequately evaluated by students;
  - C. The program leadership uses evaluation and self-assessment to update the program; and
8. We examined a detailed list of candidates in the program.

The program has many strong points. We were especially impressed by the following aspects of the program:

1. GOV360 and Emergenetics – The Georgia program uses its proprietary GOV360 and Emergenetics to help participants gain self-awareness.
2. The Georgia CPM program uses a peer consulting process that is worthy of review for possible replication.
3. The group service learning project requires CPM candidates to apply the leadership and project execution skills they learn in the program to develop and deliver a project that helps the broader community.

4. The program has a series of 24 ‘essential questions’ which are really writing prompts to help the participants process what they learn in the program.

5. Certified Public Manager® Conference: The Georgia program holds a Certified Public Manager® Conference for current participants and alumni at the end of the program year. The conference includes a CPM candidate track and alumni track. The alumni track features sessions led by CPM graduates. Alumni submit session proposals which are vetted and selected through a competitive process.

The last day of the conference features an outstanding graduation program for participants in all five cohorts.

6. In recognition of their accomplishment, graduates a receive custom Georgia Certified Public Manager® program graduation stoles and framed certificates of completion.

The findings and recommendations are based on a review of all documentation by the committee and confirmed by a site visit by the chair May 23-25, 2023.

Committee Recommendation:

Accredit                       Accredited Provisionally                       Not Accredited

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

---

---

---

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

Lance Noe, MPA, Instructor Member

Colleen Clark, CPM, CPM Member

And

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

September 30, 2023  
Date

## NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

**Program under evaluation:** Georgia Certified Public Manager® Program **Date:** 09/26/2023

**Evaluator's Name:** Ann Cotten

**Evaluator's Role:**  Review Committee Chair  CPM Graduate  CPM Instructor

<b>Standard 1: Mission and Public Service</b>
---

The program has a program specific mission statement?  Yes  No

Does it guide public service performance expectations?  Yes  No

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

**Evaluator's Comments:**

The Georgia CPM program's mission statement was developed by its advisory board. The mission statement is present on the program's website, influences the capstone project, and impacts the program's learning standards.

**Items of Note:**

1. The Georgia program has a required service-learning project which requires the participants to work in groups to design and implement a service learning project. The groups are not given instructions and are expected to apply what they learn in the program to see how the concepts apply in their group process.

2. The program conducts regular assessments including surveys of participants about their experiences in the program. In addition, the program faculty conducted a SWOT analysis for the program. The program is regularly reviewed at biannual advisory board meetings.

The program conducts surveys of graduates at 3 into the program and 6 months after graduation.

The program evaluations are used by the Director of the CPM program, the Leadership Development Unit Manager, and the Associate Director of the Government Training, Education, and Development Division to update the program annually.

**Suggestions for Improvement (if any):**

None.

**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**  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 program meets the 300 hour structured learning requirement aligned to the core competencies. Thirty-six of those hours are in the form of self-selected continuing education, conference participation, or college credit. Participants document their learning via an elective learning form. The program also has a substitution policy.

Participants like the program's hybrid format.

#### Items of Note:

The Georgia CPM program uses Emergenetics and its proprietary GOV360 assessment as tools for participant self awareness. Both are considered best practices for the program.

The program documents alignment of the curriculum with the core competencies.

Participant capstone projects benefit the individual's organization. In addition, participants complete a group service learning project that benefits the community.

**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:**

The program is self funded and executed in a professional manner down to the smallest details. The program has an advisory group that meets twice per year. Members are well qualified to teach in the program bringing academic and applied skill sets. The program is academically grounded and uses two textbooks. For the most part, administrative policies are clear.

Policies and procedures are well documented for the Georgia program.

The program uses the University of Georgia's learning management system.

The program is supported by the administrative structure of the Carl Vinson Institute, one of the most well-respected public service centers in the country.

The advisory board is dedicated to the program and is focused on elevating the value of the CPM credential. The board is also interested in having the program increase continuing education offerings for graduates.

**Items of Note:**

Click or tap here to enter text.

**Suggestions for Improvement (if any):**

Include the substitution policy in participants' program materials.

**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:

The program meets the requirements for planning and implementation.

#### 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 Georgia CPM program does regular assessments of participants' performance as well as assessments of participants' experience with the program including assessments at three and six months post graduation. The program has a regular process of program review and update.

#### Items of Note:

The post program assessment 6 months post-graduation is a noteworthy item.

#### Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

The program might consider more frequent assessments of participants' experience with the program.

**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 Georgia Certified Public Manager® Program is thoughtfully designed and delivered. There are several aspects of the program that are worthy of consideration for replication.

1. The program offers scholarships
2. GOV360 and Emergenetics – The Georgia program uses its proprietary GOV360 and Emergenetics to help participants gain self awareness.

3. The Georgia CPM program uses a peer consulting process that is worthy of review for possible replication.
4. The group service learning project is a great way for CPM candidates to apply the leadership and project execution skills they learn in the program to a project that helps the broader community,
5. The program has a series of 24 'essential questions' which are really writing prompts to help the participants process what they learn in the program.
6. Certified Public Manager® Conference: The Georgia program holds a Certified Public Manager® Conference for current participants and alumni at the end of the program year. The conference has a CPM candidate track and alumni track. The alumni track features sessions led by CPM graduates. Alumni submit session proposals which are vetted and selected through a competitive process.

The last day of the conference features an outstanding graduation program for participants in all five cohorts.

6. In recognition of their accomplishment, graduates receive custom Georgia Certified Public Manager® program graduation stoles and framed certificates of completion.

7. The alumni group struggles to find individuals willing to take on leadership roles in the group. The Georgia program's annual CPM conference which is open to alumni and required for current participants, provides a good mechanism to keep alumni engaged.

**Any other comments or concerns?**

Click or tap here to enter text.

## NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Georgia      Date: 9/28/23

Evaluator's Name: Lance Noe

Evaluator's Role:     Review Committee Chair     CPM Graduate     CPM Instructor

<b>Standard 1: Mission and Public Service</b>
---

The program has a program specific mission statement?       Yes       No

Does it guide public service performance expectations?       Yes       No

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

**Evaluator's Comments:**

A mature and experienced program mission and design has produced a sustainable and relevant program experience

**Items of Note:**

None

**Suggestions for Improvement (if any):**

None

**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

 Yes

 No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

No concerns – fully meeting standard

<b>Standard 2: Core Competencies</b>
--------------------------------------

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:**

Fully meets the core competencies standards

**Items of Note:**

None

**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.

<b>Standard 3: Resources and Capacity</b>
---

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 meets the standard for resources and capacity

**Items of Note:**

None

**Suggestions for Improvement (if any):**

None

**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:

Virtual meetings and review of website, etc. affirms the standards is met

#### Items of Note:

NA

#### Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

NA

**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:

As communicated in conversations with review team

#### Items of Note:

Stories shared in conversation with program director and instructor

#### Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

NA

**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?**

It is clear that Georgia leads and facilitates an effective CPM program. Program leaders are focused on quality and continuous improvement. They are reflective in their approach to improvement and understand future challenges and needs. They also have demonstrated that they have in place an effective leadership transition plan essential to maintaining constant quality.

**Any other comments or concerns?**

None

## NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Georgia Date: 9/29/2023

Evaluator's Name: Colleen Clark

Evaluator's Role:  Review Committee Chair  CPM Graduate  CPM Instructor

### Standard 1: Mission and Public Service

The program has a program specific mission statement?  Yes  No

Does it guide public service performance expectations?  Yes  No

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

#### Evaluator's Comments:

A robust program that provides an exceptional development experience for it's students.

#### Items of Note:

None

#### Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

None

**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  Yes  No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

No concerns. Program meets standards.

<b>Standard 2: Core Competencies</b>
--------------------------------------

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:**

Program meets core competencies standards.

**Items of Note:**

None

**Suggestions for Improvement (if any):**

None

**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:

No Concern. Program meets standard.

<b>Standard 3: Resources and Capacity</b>
---

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:**

This program meets the Resources and Capacity standard.

**Items of Note:**

None.

**Suggestions for Improvement (if any):**

None.

**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:

No concern. Program meets standard.

#### 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:

This program meets the Planning and Implementation standard.

#### Items of Note:

None.

#### Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

None.

**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:

No concern. Program meets standard.

<b>Standard 5: Effectiveness and Improvement</b>
--

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:**

This program meets the Effectiveness and Improvement standard.

**Items of Note:**

None.

**Suggestions for Improvement (if any):**

None.

**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:

No concern. Program meets standard.

**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?**

Efforts to provide an Alumni group with continued education, networking, and program engagement.

**Any other comments or concerns?**

None.