**NCPMC Accreditation Standards**

**Program Accreditation Review Checklist**

**Program under evaluation: Idaho Date: 09/15/2023**

**Evaluator’s Name: Barbara Gardner**

**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:

Idaho’s CPM Program takes a rigorous approach to program evaluation, utilizing a number of assessment tools to ensure that the program continues to meet the expectations and needs for leadership development. The mission statement and vision are expanded through a discussion of the program’s goals. Their Mission Statement is:

“To equip Idaho’s future leaders to meet today’s challenges and create a better tomorrow”

Items of Note:

Idaho incorporates all seven competencies into every aspect of the program from instruction, evaluation, theory and program operations to their mission and vision.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

**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 participants complete an array of assignments that integrate all the competencies as well as a portfolio. The assignments include:

1. Competency Assessment (for portfolio) with a rating around the seven CPM competencies.
2. Purpose Driven Leader- identifying goals for the program
3. How to navigate Ethical Challenges-create a code of ethics for the organization
4. How Public Policy is Made-create a policy narrative.Revised Gantt Chart for the progress of their capstone work
5. Assigned Book Discussion and Group Presentation
6. Peer Review of Capstone Report (drafts)
7. Capstone Proposal, Final Report and Presentation

Items of Note:

Along with the capstone project, each participant must submit a learning portfolio. The learning portfolio encompasses the implementation of course concepts and is housed and categorized by the seven competencies. During the portfolio submission, participants are encouraged to connect learning back to their initial assessment to demonstrate growth and the application of CPM competencies to their work.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

No Improvements Needed!

**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:

Idaho’s CPM Logic Model demonstrates how the program has aligned resources to fulfil the agency’s mission, goals, objectives, and outcomes. Idaho’s CPM Program enjoys financial support which is both predictable and stable from year to year.The Idaho Program maintains a formal Advisory Board that is managed by the DHR Administrator and the CPM Program Manager.

Items of Note:

Idaho’s CPM Program has been recognized and supported by the Governor’s office with Executive Order NO 2011-13

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

NA

**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:

The Idaho CPM staff have worked hard to build a logical and aligned scaffold of mission, goals, curriculum objectives, classroom activities, and program deliverables within their program. Idaho takes a rigorous approach to program evaluation as evident by the evidence presented to this team. They utilize a number of assessment tools to ensure that the program continues to meet the expectations and needs for leadership development in the public sector.

Items of Note:

All assessment results are shared with instructors to ensure that instruction and content meet high standards of excellence. Idaho’s CPM Prgram also request feedback from Alumni. This feedback helps to track agenct impact, participant feedback, and alumni opportunities.

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** [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:

Student evaluations are based on a series of formal [tests/assessments]. There are a number of opportunities during the course of the program for participants to give their perspectives on the program’s curriculum and provide feedback to help ensure the quality of the content and quality of instruction they are receiving. All participants are expected to complete an end of course evaluation.

Items of Note:

We find examinations and projects to be one of the strong points of the Idaho program. Along with the capstone project, each participant must submit a learning portfolio.

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** [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?

Idaho’s program is strong and well organized. Being a state run program without the benefit of receiving general funds this program knows how to use all their resources to their fullest potential. It is hard to choose just one or two things that this program does effective or remarkable the list is long:

Exemplary Capstone Project Outline and Format alignment

1. Excellent NCTM Program Alignment-Matrix is comprehensive.
2. The overall program is organized with exemplary quality for all supporting materials. The branding and professional quality is commendable.
3. The CPM Participant Handbook is exceptional.
4. The Competency Self-Assessment is excellent.
5. The instructor guide is an asset that lends itself to consistency of practice.
6. Tremendous evidence of valuable Alumni input and Advisory Board Consistent feedback and support.

Any other comments or concerns?

The participants are very fortunate to be in a program run by this amazing team! Way to go Idaho!