

CONTINUING ACCREDITATION REPORT
ON
THE ALABAMA CERTIFIED PUBLIC MANAGER® PROGRAM

Presented to:
The National Certified Public Manager Consortium

By the Review committee:

Dr. Ann Cotten, Chair
Frank Nugent (Instructor)
Leah Moseley (CPM Alum)

August 2020

We, the members of the committee appointed to review the Alabama Certified Public Manger® program for continuing accreditation are pleased to report we have completed our review and recommend, that the Alabama CPM program be accredited for the maximum period authorized by the bylaws. Our recommendation is based on the following findings:

Findings

1. Alabama program administrators submitted all required program documentation to each of the review committee membership;
2. After review by committee members all supplemental documentation was provided on a timely basis;
3. In the matter of general program requirements the committee determined that:
 - A. Adequate linkages exist between the university-based program and state government agencies;
 - B. An advisory board is actively involved in dealing with appropriate program issues;
 - C. The program, while emphasizing service to state government, is actively and successfully marketing to local and federal 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 instructors and practitioners.

We find thorough documentation of administrative policies and procedures in a combination of administrative policy and formal regulations.

We further find:

- A. A formal manual tracking system is in place.

- B. Project requirements are clear and the use of projects in the curriculum is one of the strengths of the program;
 - C. Adequate security exists for student records; and
 - D. Student evaluations are based on a series of formal assessments of the guided learning journal, individual project, and Solutions Alabama project.
- 5. 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. The program, while responsive to the competencies, is well integrated;
 - D. Clear policies regarding substitutions are in place;
 - E. All requirements regarding hours of instruction are met.
- 6. We find projects and the leadership journals to be strong points of the Alabama program.
- 7. In regard to program evaluation we find:
 - A. Each course is adequately evaluated by students;
 - B. Each instructor is adequately evaluated by students;
 - C. There is strong support for the program among key government stakeholders. Agencies value the opportunity to send managers to the program and view completing the program as an important professional development opportunity.
- 8. We examined a detailed list of candidates in the program.
- 9. The committee recommends the program consider the following opportunities for improvement
 - A. ***Program expansion to municipal governments.*** There is some degree of market saturation among state agencies. Municipal government agencies in Alabama represent a potential growth area for the program. Given the program's positive experience with virtual learning, there may be an

opportunity to offer the program in a hybrid format that makes it more accessible to municipal government employees.

- B. ***Consider reducing the number of required program hours.*** The program far exceed the 300 hour requirement for accreditation. The program should review the content to identify potential opportunities to scale back the number of required program hours.
- C. ***Consider using a learning management system.*** The program does not currently use a learning management system. Participant attendance and assignments are tracked on an Access database and updates are sent to participants at fixed intervals. A learning management system would help reduce the administrative burden on the program staff and make course materials and grades readily accessible to program participants.
- D. ***Consider conducting a follow-up assessment with graduates.*** The program has a cadre of successful, enthusiastic supporters. However, the program lacks concrete data on impact of the program on graduates and their agencies. The program should consider conducting follow up assessments with graduates 3-5 years post completion. The assessments could track the implementation of participants' individual projects, look at the status of the Solutions Alabama projects, track participants' career trajectory post-completion, and identify continuing education opportunities for graduates. Outcome data can be used to market the program and to inform curriculum updates.

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

A. COVID TRANSITION

The Alabama CPM program was offered as a traditional in-person, cohort-based program. In response to the constraints resulting from COVID, the program has to transition to virtual program. The program team did an excellent job of pivoting to the new format. Courses were offered via Zoom in a synchronous format which allowed participants to retain the benefits of the shared experience and continue to interact with each other as a class. The participants were impressed with how the program team managed the transition to virtual learning.

As part of the transition to virtual learning, the program staff switched from paper-based evaluations to online evaluations. This innovation will likely continue once the program transitions back to an in-person format.

B. CPM PROJECTS

The Alabama CPM program is a two-year program. Upon completion of the first year (CPM I), graduates earn an Associate CPM Certificate. Upon completion of year two (CPM II), graduates are awarded the Certified Public Manager® designation. Participants

complete a capstone project for each year. CPM I students complete an individual project for their organization while CPM II participants complete a team-based Solutions Alabama project.

CPM I Project is an individual project completed for the participant's organization focused on identifying and reviewing an organizational process or procedure to identify cost savings or efficiency gains. The project culminates in a PowerPoint presentation to the CPM class, a presentation to the participants' agency, and a written report. This project produces tangible results in terms of cost savings or improved efficiency for the participant's agency. Participants' supervisors evaluate the participant's project in terms of appropriateness of the project, understanding of what is required to implement the project in the context of the organization, and presentation delivery.

The CPM I project involves an organizational impact analysis of a proposed change. The analysis examines the complexity of implementation, impact on staffing resources, financial impact, and structural needs required to support the change. The self-evaluation of the presentation a great idea. The questions also serve as a good checklist of how to deliver a strong presentation which participants can continue to use professionally.

Supervisor Evaluation of CPM I project: Supervisors review the CPM I participant projects which are focused on cost savings or improved efficiency. This is a great way to hold participants accountable for the quality of their project and to ensure that supervisors have the chance to reflect upon the impact of the project on their organization.

CPM II Capstone Project – Solutions Alabama is a team project for CPM II participants that requires participants to research and develop solutions for critical issues identified by state leaders. The project culminates in a whitepaper and presentation delivered at the Solutions Alabama event. This project provides an opportunity for participants to strengthen key management and problem-solving skills while developing real solutions for challenges facing Alabama. There is significant amount of class time dedicated in CPM II to working on the Capstone Project. The process is very well documented with clear expectations. These projects have clear benefit to the state.

Participant Self-Evaluation CPM II Capstone: There is a very comprehensive narrative evaluation instrument used to assess the CPM II capstone (Solutions Alabama) which the program director uses to adjust the project as needed.

C. INTEGRATION OF MYERS-BRIGGS THROUGHOUT CURRICULUM

The program uses the MBTI instrument to help the participants gain insight into their leadership style and to better understand how to relate and work with others. The program takes this one step further to integrate MBTI into a number of the courses. This integration makes the MBTI assessment more useful to as a leadership/management tool for the participants.

D. LEADERSHIP JOURNAL ASSESSMENTS: Participants must maintain a leadership journal in which they record their responses to key questions posed at the end

of each class. Journals are submitted for grading three times during the course of the program. The journals provide an excellent venue for participants to reflect upon what they learned and how they will apply their new knowledge or skills. The journals have an added benefit of providing insight into what the participants are learning and how they are planning to use what they learned.

E. **SUPERVISOR APPROVAL OF ABSENCES**: Participants must get pre-approval from their supervisor to be absent from the program. The participant must notify their supervisor and the CPM program director by email about their intended absence.

F. **YMCA CAMP CHANDLER TEAM BUILDING** – This outdoor team building activity is a valuable experience for most of the CPM Participants. Even participants who did not particularly like Camp Chandler saw the value in the activity for other participants.

G. **COLLEGE CREDIT**: The program offers 6 graduate credits toward the elective credit requirement for the AUM MPA program for those who complete CPM I & II. The program is in the process of securing 6 graduate credits waivers for the MBA program as well. Additionally, the Provost has asked the program director to seek a 12-credit waiver for the program due to the extensive and rigorous nature of the Alabama CPM program.

H. **ALABAMA SOCIETY OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC MANAGERS** is for graduates and current participants. Current participants can receive CPM elective credits for attending society events throughout the year. This is a significant incentive for CPM candidates to get involved with the society. The Board and Officers of the society also serve as the advisory board for the Alabama CPM program. This creates great synergy between the current participants and graduates and the program and its alumni base. The program manager meets monthly with the advisory board.

The findings and recommendations are based on a review of all documentation by the committee and confirmed by a virtual site visit by the chair and the members of the accreditation committee August 19-21, 2020.

Committee Recommendation

Accredit ☒ Accredit Provisionally ☐ Not Accredit ☐

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

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

[Name]: Frank Nugent, CPM Instructor

[Name]: Leah Moseley, CPM Graduate

And

Ann Cotten, Chair, for the Committee

09/21/2020

NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Alabama Certified Public Manager® Program

Date: 08/18/2020

Evaluator's Name: Dr. Ann Cotten

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 Alabama CPM program has a comprehensive evaluation process that includes participant reactions (session and program), a participant leadership journal, and supervisor assessments of organizational impact. There is also an annual focus groups with key stakeholders to discuss the program evaluations and identify opportunities for program improvement.

Items of Note:

CPM I Project Evaluation: This project has a strong evaluation process – Instructor evaluation, peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and supervisor evaluation. This is a very valuable process to support self-reflection and growth.

Supervisor Evaluation of CPM I project: Supervisors review the CPM I participant projects which are focused on cost savings or improved efficiency. This is a great way to hold participants accountable for the quality of their project and to ensure that supervisors have the chance to reflect upon the impact of the project on their organization.

Participant Self-Evaluation CPM II Capstone: There is a very comprehensive narrative evaluation instrument used to assess the CPM II capstone (Solutions Alabama)

Leadership Journal Evaluations: Participants must maintain a leadership journal in which they record their responses to key questions posed at the end of each class. Journals are submitted for grading three times during the course of the program. The journals provide an excellent venue for participants to reflect upon what they learned and how they will apply their new knowledge or skills. The journals have an added benefit of providing insight into what the participants are learning and how they are planning to use what they learned.

Supervisor Approval for Absences: Participants must get pre-approval from their supervisor to be absent from the program. The participant must notify their supervisor and the CPM program director by email about their intended absence.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Session Evaluations: The session evaluation instruments might be more helpful if they asked specifically for suggestions for improving the session or material that could be dropped from the session.

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 requires 419 hours, 119 more than needed. Sixty of those hours come from required elective credits (30 in CPM I and 30 in CPM II).

Items of Note:

The Alabama CPM program requires two projects.

CPM I Project is an individual project completed for the participant's organization focused on identifying and reviewing an organizational process or procedure to identify cost savings or efficiency gains. The project culminates in a PowerPoint presentation to the CPM class, a presentation to the participants' agency, and a written report. This project produces tangible results in terms of cost savings or improved efficiency for the participant's agency. Participants' supervisors to evaluate the participant's project in terms of appropriateness of the project, understanding of what is required to implement the project in the context of the organization, and presentation delivery. A

The CPM I project involves an organizational impact analysis of the propose change looking at complexity of implementation, impact on staffing resources, financial impact, and structural needs required to support the change. The self-evaluation of the presentation a great idea. The questions can serve as a good checklist of how to deliver a strong presentation.

CPM II Capstone Project – Solutions Alabama is a team project for CPM II participants that requires participants to research and develop solutions for critical issues identified by state leaders. The project culminates in a whitepaper and presentation delivered at the Solutions Alabama event. This project provides an opportunity for participants to strengthen key management and problem-solving skills while developing real solutions for challenges facing Georgia. There is significant amount of class time dedicated in CPM II to working on the Capstone Project. The process is very well documented with clear expectations. These projects have clear benefit to the state.

YMCA Camp Chandler Team Building – This outdoor team building activity is a valuable experience for most of the CPM Participants. Even participants who did not particularly like Camp Chandler saw the value in the activity for other participants.

College Credit: The program offers 6 graduate credits toward the elective credit requirement for the AUM MPA program for those who complete CPM I & II. The program is in the process of securing 6 graduate credits waivers for the MBA program as well. Additionally, the Provost has asked the program director to seek a 12-credit waiver for the program due to the extensive and rigorous nature of the Alabama CPM program.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

The Legacy Lessons for CPM Solutions Alabama could be organized topically to be more useful to the participants.

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 Alabama CPM program is housed in the Office of Continuing Education which reports to the Provost/Sr. Vice Chancellor. The program is self-funded and generated a 10% residual which is allowed to accumulate in a reserve fund. The reserve fund had a \$25,000 balance from FY 2019. The program is allowed to use the funds for program expansion.

The program instructors include a mix of faculty, consultants, and professionals. The faculty are well-qualified for the courses they teach.

Items of Note:

Funding: While the program is self-supporting. It was expected to generate a 10% residual in FY 2020. The program is allowed to accumulate reserves.

Program documentation: The program has excellent documentation of its administrative cycle. The documentation included the recruitment/registration process; administrative processes for creating materials and communicating with each new class; a list of supplies needed for the program; room set up instructions; and special needs for each session.

Alabama Society of Certified Public Managers is for graduates and current participants. Current participants are encouraged to attend society events through the elective process. The Board and Officers of the society also serve as the advisory board for the Alabama CPM program. This creates great synergy between the current participants and graduates and the program and its alumni base.

The program manager meets monthly with the advisory board.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The program adequately meets Standard 3: Resources and Capacity

☒ Yes

☐ No

If no, then please explain your concern here:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Standard 4: Planning and Implementation

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

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

Are participant records held securely and confidentially? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Are assessment review standards clearly specified? ☐ Yes ☐ No

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

Evaluator's Comments:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Items of Note:

Agency Commissioner Participation: The program has good participation from agency leaders as presenters, participation in graduation, and hosting informational meetings.

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:

Items of Note:

Participant Self-Evaluation of Capstone II Project: There is a very comprehensive narrative evaluation instrument used to assess the CPM II capstone (Solutions Alabama) which the program director uses to adjust the project as needed.

Leadership Journal Assessments: Participants must maintain a leadership journal in which they record their responses to key questions posed at the end of each class. Journals are submitted for grading three times during the course of the program. The journals provide an excellent venue for participants to reflect upon what they learned and how they will apply their new knowledge or skills. The journals have an added benefit of providing insight into what the participants are learning and how they are planning to use what they learned.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Consider conducting a follow-up assessment with graduates. The program has a cadre of successful, enthusiastic supporters. However, the program lacks concrete data on impact of the program on graduates and their agencies. The program should consider conducting follow up assessments with graduates 3-5 years post completion. The assessments could track the implementation of participants' individual projects, look at the status of the Solutions Alabama projects, track participants' career trajectory post-completion, and identify

continuing education opportunities for graduates. Outcome data can be used to market the program and to inform curriculum updates.

Consider using a learning management system. The program does not currently use a learning management system. Participant attendance and assignments are tracked on an Access database and updates are sent to participants at fixed intervals. A learning management system would help reduce the administrative burden on the program staff and make course materials and grades readily accessible to program participants.

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?

There are several effective practices in the Alabama CPM program. Each of the practices listed below is discussed in the body of the report.

Solutions Alabama team projects designed to address statewide issues.

Learning Journal Assessments

Integration of MBTI throughout the curriculum.
Supervisor approval of absences.
Alabama CPM Society.

Any other comments or concerns?

The Alabama CPM project is a well-planned, well-executed CPM program. The program is widely respected by graduates, stakeholders, and participants alike. The program director did an excellent job of navigating the transition to online instruction during the COVID crisis. Overall, this is a first rate CPM program.

Click or tap here to enter text.

NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Alabama CPM Program

Date: August 21, 2020

Evaluator's Name: Frank Nugent

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:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

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:

Items of Note:

The program has a lot more than 300 hours and the Director was going to see if he can reduce some of the extra hours.

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 instructors were highly regarded and our team will be meeting with the Advisory group this afternoon.

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:

The Director seems to go above and beyond to help his students. He is very dedicated and passionate about the CPM program.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

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 believe this is the area that the Director excels. He frequently meets with the faculty and students to make sure the program exceeds expectations. The Director has also done an outstanding job collaborating with outside agencies.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

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

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

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

If no, then please explain your concern here:

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

In Conclusion

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

☒ **Yes** ☐ **Conditionally Yes** ☐ **No**

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

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

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

The amount of respect that students, faculty, the Provost and stakeholders have for the Director of the program.

The Instructors were certainly passionate for the program and wanted to make sure their classes and the program got better each year.

The continuous improvement process.

Any other comments or concerns?

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

NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Alabama CPM Program

Date: 08/21/2020

Evaluator's Name: Leah Moseley

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:

Repeated theme: "Know Yourself to Lead Yourself, and Lead Yourself to Lead Your Team" is something that sticks out. It goes perfectly with the CPMs approach to leadership.

I feel like all the current and former CPM students, instructors, board members, and Neal and his team are all following the mission for CPM and meeting performance expectations.

Items of Note:

Camp Chandler seems to be a great team building experience for almost all participants.

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:

Activities, projects, and journals address the curriculum and provide structured learning.

Items of Note:

Several students mentioned wanting to have more time on their capstone, and liked the idea of starting it in year one.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Possibly start the final project in CPM 1. Also do some kind of follow up with students to see if their project was implemented, and how it benefits their agency. Did they get a promotion for it? (keeping up with records/data such as that can be a great recruiting tool)

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:

Policies are in place to allow instructors, administrators, and staff to fulfill the mission. The University has great resources they utilize and have a very productive team.

Items of Note:

Resources were effectively utilized when transitioning to zoom this year during the pandemic.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Continue to offer blended classes to reach students in the far part of the state who may not otherwise be able to participate.

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:

Neal and his team are taking proper steps to keep records secure. They have an effective method of gathering evaluations and taking them into consideration to improve their program or classes.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Access is outdated (in my opinion) I would look for a better, more secure data management program to keep records and ensure privacy .

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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	---	-----------------------------

Does the program invite participant evaluation of classes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	---	-----------------------------

Does the program evaluate assessment outcomes to improve the program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
---	---	-----------------------------

Does the program demonstrate and implement a plan of appropriate strategic growth?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	---	-----------------------------

Does the program promote a culture of continuous improvement processes?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
---	---	-----------------------------

Evaluator's Comments:

I was very impressed with the thorough material sent for review, and I had plenty of time to go over it which made this process much easier.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Follow up with former graduates, send out a survey or something to their email, see where they end up and what kind of jobs/promotions they receive after going through 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?

Click or tap here to enter text.

Any other comments or concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.