CONTINUING ACCREDITATION REPORT

ON

THE PENNSYLVANIA CERTIFIED PUBLIC MANAGER PROGRAM

Presented to:

The National Certified Public Manager Consortium

By the Review Committee:

Chair Chad Kinsella, PhD
David Lakly
Jeffrey Dinkins

October 2023

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

Findings

1. The Pennsylvania CPM program administrators submitted all required program documentation to each of the review committee members;

2. After review by committee members, all supplemental documentation was provided, and requested interviews were scheduled on a timely basis;

3. In the matter of general program requirements, the committee determined that:

   A. Strong linkages exist with institutions of higher education and the CPM Program through the partnership with the Workforce Development Program within the Office of Grants, Sponsored Programs, and Research at Millersville University;

   B. An advisory board is actively involved in dealing with appropriate program issues;

   C. The program, while emphasizing service to government entities in the immediate area of Lancaster County, is actively and successfully marketing to local and state customers;

   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 a combination of appropriated funds and fees;

   B. Program instruction is provided by a combination of well-qualified local employees and contract instructors.

5. We find thorough documentation of administrative policies and procedures in a combination of administrative policy and formal regulations, which are well-detailed and explained.

We further find:

A. Capstone project requirements are clear and the use of projects in the curriculum is one of the strengths of the program;

B. Adequate security exists for student records and is in line with requirements for higher education institutions, in general;

C. Student evaluations are based on a series of formal writing assignments, discussions, and other 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 and each phase of the program;

C. The two-phase structure of the program helps with student retention and reinforces key CPM competencies;

D. All requirements regarding hours of instruction are met.

7. We find assessments and especially the capstone project to be one of the strong points of the Pennsylvania CPM program as alumni pointed to the benefits of these assessments to their professional growth.

8. 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 feedback from alumni and teachers is highly consistent, suggesting that the program successfully caters to different learning styles, sets clear expectations, and covers a wide range of applicable topics that meet the needs of a broad scope of public and nonprofit professionals.

9. We met with and examined a detailed list of alumni in the program and found that participants are well-prepared for the program.

10. We discussed the program's perceived strengths and weaknesses. We are impressed by the efforts to address areas needing improvement, especially:

A. Marketing and expanding the program beyond Lancaster County and the surrounding area to all parts of Pennsylvania to service all areas of the state;
B. Seeking staffing and partnerships to support the increasing demands of the program;

11. The committee recommends the program review and consider examining course content in three specific areas:

A. Ensuring that makeups, attendance, and substitutions are more adequately communicated;
B. Adding specific language for each course to tie course material and topics back to the core CPM competencies;
C. Consider adding alumni and other public sector employees to the CPM Advisory Board.
D. Consider providing course evaluations directly to the instructor(s) so they can react to, retain, and/or improve upon student feedback.

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

A. The value that alumni find in the capstone projects and the program overall and that each strongly encourages colleagues and mentees to enroll in the Pennsylvania CPM Program;

B. The two-phase approach to the program;

C. The strong support and connection the Pennsylvania CPM Program has with Millersville University.

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 October 13, 2023.

Committee Recommendation:

Accredit **X** Accredit Provisionally ☐ Not Accredit ☐

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

Note: one of the checklists below selected Accredit Provisionally but was impressed by the added documents and on-site visit and fully endorse the recommendation to Accredit the Pennsylvania CPM Program.

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

[Name]: David Lakly

[Name]: Jeffrey Dinkins

And

Chad J. Kinsella

Chad Kinsella, PhD, Chair, for the Committee

10/13/2023
Date

NCPMC Accreditation Standards
Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Pennsylvania Date: 10/13/2023

Evaluator's Name: Chad Kinsella, PhD

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:

The following were stated clearly in the report submitted, specifically on Page 1, Paragraph 2, and in the Appendix under Program Overview.

Items of Note:

N/A

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

The Mission Statement is worded differently in different places throughout the different supporting documents. This should be consistent throughout.

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 CPM core competencies are not clearly mentioned or used in the curriculum. It is suggested that these be more concretely mentioned and each lesson should mention which competencies are being used.

Items of Note:

N/A

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Although there is evidence that the core CPM competencies are used they need to be more clearly stated in supporting documents and in the curriculum.

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:

More detail is needed to clearly state how the Pennsylvania CPM Program has adequate resources to accomplish its mission. The advisory board is, arguably, overloaded with academics as opposed to practitioners.

Items of Note:

N/A

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Policies and procedures that promote effective management and operation of the program need to be strengthened. Also, more needs to be done to clearly link administrative procedures to the mission. Finally, it is suggested that more practitioners and CPM graduates fill advisory board seats to help improve the program and increase the number of participants by using board members to recruit.

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:

Hybrid online and flex attendance make it easier for participants to make-up or attend sessions.

Items of Note:

Initial supplied documents did not show much evidence of participatory planning for intended outcomes but subsequent documents and the on-site visit clearly show that this program does do this and quite well.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

It is not clear if and how evaluation results are taken into consideration for teaching and program improvements. It is suggested that evaluation results be more clearly utilized for continuous 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 ☒ **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:

N/A

Items of Note:

The on-site visit provided excellent information as to the intent of strategic growth for the program.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Although rubrics are provided there needs to be summary evaluation material provided for each class/cohort on performance. It also needs to be made clear how the rubrics and session evaluation materials are used for continuous improvement in the program, individual courses, and instructors.

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?

Click or tap here to enter text.

Any other comments or concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

NCPMC Accreditation Standards
Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Pennsylvania Certified Public Manager Program **Date:** 9/14/2023

Evaluator's Name: Dave Lakly

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:

Well-stated mission, and the program objectives support the mission and appear measurable and achievable. There does not seem to be evidence for 1.2 in the provided materials, and will need to be expanded on in the site vistis, I think. There is evidence of an evaluation program, but I did not see any results of evaluations done to date.

Items of Note:

There is a slight difference in the mission statement offered in the program overview document and the one in the candidate handbook. The difference is small, but I think noteworthly

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 ☒ **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 compared the PACPM Curriculum document to the NCPMC adopted competencies, and they adequately address these across the curriculum. Appendix O also supports this evaluation. The capstone project meets expectations.

Items of Note:

Samples from capstones.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

I would like to see more detail on one or more of the actual capstone projects. Snippets of savings generated is helpful, but I'd like to look at more.

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:

There's a budget, but fail to see how 6 people make this sustainable...

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:

I need more data on evaluation and assessment results and how they are used to fully assess this area.

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:

I don't see enough evidence here.

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?

This is my pre-site visit assessment – if they can provide some additional evidence around sustainability, evaluation, and assessment, I think I can change this to a "yes".

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

Any other comments or concerns?

If an item did not have "yes" or "no" checked, it was because I was on the fence, not because I ignored it. Those are all items I expect to get more details on during the site visit.

NCPMC Accreditation Standards
Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Pennsylvania Date: 10 13 23

Evaluator's Name: Jeffrey Dinkins, Sr., CPM ®

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:

The concepts, short term and long term goals and objectives are strategically aligned for the Pennsylvania CPM continued growth. I can forecast a robust program that will benefit those that complete the Pennsylvania Certified Public Manager® Program.

Items of Note:

The current Pennsylvania CPM Instructions have provided great training that will be a benefit to those customers, partners, and citizens they interface with.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

If feasible, explore a CPM Cohort in person.

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 curriculum will continue to provide competencies that will enhance the learing environment.

Items of Note:

N/A

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

N/A

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 Pennsylvania CPM has adequate resources that will continue to enhance the program.

Items of Note:

n/a

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:

The planning and implementation for the future of the program is on a solid foundation.

Items of Note:

n/a

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 program has made a positive impact on the University and community.

Items of Note:

n/a

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

n/a

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?

I would emulate a more extensive virtual training to copy the Pennsylvania Program. My program was in person.

Any other comments or concerns?

n/a