

INITIAL ACCREDITATION REPORT
ON
THE UTAH CERTIFIED PUBLIC MANAGER® PROGRAM

Presented to:

The National Certified Public Manager Consortium

By the Review Committee:

Charles D. Taylor, Committee Chair
Jan Sims, Mississippi CPM Program
Jana Huffaker, Idaho CPM Program

October 2020

We, the members of the committee appointed to review the Utah Certified Public Manager (UCPM) program for initial accreditation are pleased to report we have completed our review and recommend, without qualification, that the Utah CPM program be awarded initial accreditation for the maximum period authorized by the bylaws. Our recommendation is based on the findings presented in this report.

The UCPM administrators submitted all required program documentation for review by the committee members. After review by the committee all requested supplemental documentation and information was provided on a timely basis at the time of the site visit.

The site visit was accomplished by means of a series of videoconferences with UCPM administrators, staff, and stakeholders. The videoconferences were conducted on September 8, 9, and 16, 2020.

Findings with regard to Standard 1: Mission and Public Service

The committee determined that:

1. The program has a program specific mission statement.
2. The mission statement guides public service performance expectations.
3. There is a method of program operations and performance evaluation.

Further comments:

UVU has recently assumed administrative responsibilities for the UCPM program from the Utah Department of Human Resource Management. The UCPM program and its mission, vision, and values align well with the Utah Valley University (UVU) Mission and Vision 2030 strategies. In particular, it enhances UVU's existing and longstanding portfolio of professional educational and training programs.

Findings with regard to Standard 2: Core Competencies

The committee determined that:

1. The CPM Core Competencies are adequately addressed across the curriculum.
2. The program consists of 300 or more hours of structured learning activities.
3. The program has a public management project (capstone) that includes a written component.
4. The public management projects benefit participant organizations.

Further comments:

UCPM administrators provided a detailed matrix illustrating the distribution of competencies across courses and modules within courses. Each course contains assignments and activities designed to ensure that experiential learning occurs.

Because this program is new, no participants have yet taken Course 3, the capstone course. Information provided by UCPM, however, well documents plans for supporting participants in choosing and completing their capstone projects.

Findings with regard to Standard 3: Resources and Capacity

The committee determined that:

1. The program adequately documents the adequacy of its resources and capacity to fulfill its mission.
2. The program has policies and procedures that promote effective management and operation of the program in a sustainable manner.
3. The policies provide guidance linking administrative procedures to the mission.
4. The program utilizes instructors who demonstrate academic and/or professional experience to be qualified for the content they teach.
5. The program has a governing or advisory group guiding policy, recommendations, and potential clientele.

Further comments:

UVU has a long history in the provision of professional and executive development programs, in both credit and non-credit formats and, therefore, have the administrative infrastructure and experience to support the addition of the UCPM program to their portfolio. Because of this history, the UVU academic faculty who teach in the UCPM program are experienced in instructing adult learners and are enthusiastic about teaching CPM participants. The UCPM program also uses knowledgeable practitioners as instructors for selected modules, as appropriate.

The advisory board includes representatives of important stakeholder agencies, including a representative from the Utah Department of Human Resource Management who has lengthy experience with the Certified Public Manager® Program.

Findings with regard to Standard 4: Planning and Implementation

The committee determined that:

1. The program engages in ongoing, participatory planning that provides direction for the institution and leads to the achievement of intended outcomes for programs and services.

2. The program's planning and implementation processes are sufficiently flexible to address unexpected circumstances while maintaining the program's rigor and viability.
3. Participant records are held securely and confidentially.
4. Assessment review standards are clearly specified.
5. Evaluation results are taken into consideration for program improvements.

Further comments:

The UCPM program supplements traditional course evaluations with stakeholder focus groups. As one result of a focus group, UCPM administrators recruited UVU communications faculty to teach the communications topics in the curriculum, providing one demonstration of how feedback and assessment informs curriculum revision.

The UCPM program, like many programs, was forced to shift from face-to-face delivery to online delivery of CPM training due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The UCPM program is utilizing Zoom videoconferencing technology to deliver CPM training synchronously, using Zoom's breakout rooms to replicate as closely as practicable the mixture of lecture, full group discussion, and small group activity that instructors utilized in the physical classroom. Conversations with faculty and students indicate that the program has successfully implemented that transition.

With its long experience in delivering professional and executive development programs, UVU has proven systems for secure and confidential storage of participant records.

Findings with regard to Standard 5: Effectiveness and Improvement

The committee determined that:

1. The program assesses how well participants are meeting the expectations of faculty.
2. The program invites participant evaluation of classes.
3. The program evaluates assessment outcomes to improve the program.
4. The program demonstrates and implements a plan of appropriate strategic growth.
5. The program promotes a culture of continuous improvement processes.

Further comments:

The UCPM program assesses participant and program outcomes and incorporates feedback to continuously strengthen and improve the program. The UCPM program has a well-defined list of program goals for 2020-2021 that guides the program's pursuit of its mission and vision.

Committee Recommendations

The committee recommends that the program consider the following:

1. Increasing the number of external members on the advisory board.

Approximately 50 percent of advisory board members are administrators, staff, or faculty at UVU, with the remaining members representing external constituencies. During the site visit program administrators, staff, faculty, and advisory board members acknowledged the importance of revising program curriculum to address emerging issues in the field of public management. The committee suggests that board members representing external constituencies are an important source of intelligence regarding emerging issues and recommends that UCPM consider expanding the number of external board members.

2. Continue monitoring and revising program performance goals.

The UCPM program has a set of program goals appropriate to a new program during its startup phase. The committee suggests that the program periodically review and revise its program goals to continue achievement of its mission and vision.

3. Expanding the geographic and sectoral footprint of the program.

The Utah CPM program was originally managed by the Utah Department of Human Resource Management. As a state-run program it had its largest constituency among state agencies, largely located in the Salt Lake City area. With its new home at UVU, the UCPM program has an opportunity to expand its reach to local governments and selected nonprofit organizations; it also has the opportunity to expand into the state's rural communities. During the site visit, program administrators and staff expressed plans for just such expansion. The committee encourages the program to continue efforts in this direction.

4. Maintain the financial sustainability of the program.

Program administrators and staff indicated during the site visit that, for initial cohorts, UVU had elected to hold the program fees at the same level as those charged by the state when DHRM was operating the program. While the committee has no knowledge of the costs covered by the program fee, during the period the program was administered by the state, it is possible that the fees didn't fully cover all costs that might be fairly allocated to the operation of the program. The committee encourages the program to monitor costs,

market demand, and other factors affecting financial sustainability and take action accordingly.

Program Strengths

The program has many strong points. The committee was especially impressed by:

1. Strong alignment of CPM program with institutional mission and experience

UVU is an integrated university and community college with extensive experience delivering professional development programs. Indeed, this type of lifelong learning and workforce development are key components of the UVU mission. Consequently, the UCPM program benefits from the existence of well-developed processes and administrative infrastructure for supporting such programs. Administrators at the highest levels support the inclusion of the CPM program in UVU's portfolio of programs.

2. Breadth and depth of faculty

The UCPM program is able to draw on academic faculty from various disciplines who are not only experienced in adult education, but are also enthusiastic about teaching in the CPM program. The program also has the ability to draw on experienced practitioners to teach selected subject matter.

3. Classroom support for faculty

During the site visit, conversations with faculty revealed that they receive a high level of classroom support from the administrative staff. For example, for the synchronous online courses currently being delivered via Zoom a dedicated staff member serves as facilitator to handle all technical needs. The faculty can then concentrate on teaching and their other interactions with participants and are free from managing the technology.

4. The opening of the Lehi satellite campus

UVU has recently opened a satellite campus in Lehi, Utah, about 30 minutes from Salt Lake City. When UCPM is able to resume face to face delivery of its courses, it will benefit from both the state of the art classrooms at this facility and its closer proximity to the state capital in Salt Lake City.

5. Opportunity to bridge non-credit and credit programs

Because of its extensive experience with professional and executive development programs similar to CPM, UVU has policies in place that allow students enrolling in for-credit programs to receive credit for prior completion of non-credit programming. These policies are a marked contrast to the obstacles that exist at many institutions of higher education.

The findings and recommendations are based on a review of all documentation by the committee and confirmed by a virtual site visit conducted on September 8, 9, and 16, 2020.

Committee Recommendation

Accredit: **X**

Accredit Provisionally:

Not Accredit:

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

N/A

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

Jana Huffaker, Idaho CPM Program

Jan Sims, Mississippi CPM Program

And



Charles D. Taylor, Indiana CPM Program,
Chair, for the Committee

10/9/20
Date

NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Utah Date: 10/9/20

Evaluator's Name: Charles Taylor

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:

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.

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:

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.

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:

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:

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.

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?

See full report

Any other comments or concerns?

See full report

NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Utah CPM Date: July 28, 2020

Evaluator's Name: Jan Sims

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:

Utah CPM program has recently migrated to Utah Valley University. From an instructor standpoint, UVU is a great location as a dual-mission institution.

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

NCPMC CPM Program Accreditation Review Checklist

☒ Yes

☐ No

Page 1 of 6

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:

Each course contains an assignment that ensures experiential learning takes place. Participants learn about themselves regarding strengths and personality, then apply what is learned through simulations, written papers, or presentations. Course 3 is the capstone project.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

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 College of Health and Public Service is adequately equipped to meet the needs of Standard 3 Resources and Capacity. Faculty are adequately represented on the Advisory Board.

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:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Items of Note:

I commend UVU for the annual stakeholder feedback with state and local government representatives to ensure relevance of the Utah CPM to address public sector agency needs.

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:

Several changes were noted (see 5.2 and 5.3) in the Accreditation Binder that demonstrate UVU's commitment to continuous improvement of the Utah CPM Program.

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?

I am delighted to read about the commitment UVU has to the sustainability and continuous improvement of the Utah CPM Program. It was a great program before the migration, and I am sure the program will continue to hold a high standard at UVU.

Any other comments or concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.

NCPMC Accreditation Standards Program Accreditation Review Checklist

Program under evaluation: Utah CPM

Date: 8/3/2020- revised 9/21/2020

Evaluator's Name: Jana Huffaker

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:

Identified alignment with UVU mission and 2030 strategies as evidence of mission driven work.

Items of Note:

Annual report, sample surveys, and performance matrix included to meet 1.2 and 1.3

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:

Matrix includes core curriculum, handbook with policies and procedures, website info.

Items of Note:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Sample project/project outline or post interview with alumni would strengthen submission.

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:

Course material and outcomes included as well as policy and procedures.

Items of Note:

Infrastructure information was stated but no evidence of projects nor delivery modality is presented.

Suggestions for Improvement (if any):

Stronger evidence would include Advisory Board meeting minutes.

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:

No concerns.

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:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Items of Note:

5.2- evidence in narrative form only

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?

Flexibility in delivery of courses.

Any other comments or concerns?

Click or tap here to enter text.