



# Welcome to the 2017 NASPAA Accreditation Institute!

*We will begin promptly at 8:00am*

**Thank you to Auburn  
University for breakfast!**



# Institute Structure

- 6 sessions
  - Together for the first and last with separate sessions for “Advanced” Program Representatives, beginners, and Site Visitor Training
- 1 hour each, 10 minute breaks
- Lunch provided
- Interactive and program-focused
- Assumes familiarity with accreditation documents and videos

# Expectations and Assumptions

- We do not repeat the videos (watch them and download the PPTs with notes).
- We apply concepts and tools.
- You will not write your self-study.
- **Goal: Return home motivated and prepared with knowledge and strategies to engage your stakeholders in strategic program management, to document what you do in your self-study report, and/or to prepare for the Site Visit.**



**Session 1ABC:**  
**8:00-9:00am**

# **The Strategic Power of Accreditation**

Debra J. Ringold  
Dean, Atkinson Graduate School of Management  
Willamette University

# Sustainability Will Depend on Program Distinctiveness

- Purpose of Strategic Management is Distinctive Value Creation
- Identify Individuals “Who Love Us Most for What We Do Best”

# Mission (Not Statement) First Explicitly Considers

- Strengths, Diversity, Achievements of Your Faculty (Standard 3)
- Strengths of Your Curriculum (Standard 5)
- Strengths of Your Pedagogy/Delivery Modality (Standard 5)
- Strengths of Your Student Support Infrastructure (Standard 4)

# Mission (Not Statement) Next Explicitly Considers

Who, Among Potential Stakeholders, Most Values the Strengths of

- Your Faculty
- Your Curriculum Your Pedagogy
- Your Student Support Infrastructure (Standard 1)



# Your Mission Statement is Your Promise to Stakeholders

- It Guides the Design and Delivery of Distinctive Value
- To Individuals “Who Love You Most for What You Do Best”

# Once You Have Your Mission and Mission Statement

Standards 2, 6 Come Into Play.

- Administrative Capacity
- Faculty Sufficiency
- Governance
- Resource Adequacy

# Communication and Other Recruitment Considerations Are Last (Standards 4, 7)

- Craft a Compelling Story
- Keep the Promises Inherent in the Mission Statement

# Accreditation as a Strategic Process is Not an End in Itself

## Accreditation Can Help Us

- Create and Deliver an Ever-Improving Student Experience
- Attract/Retain a Great Faculty
- Ensure We Are Putting Our Scarce Resources to Highest and Best Use



**Session 2A:**  
**9:10-10:10am**

# **Fundamentals: Mission & Goals**

RaJade M. Berry-James  
Associate Professor, School of Public and International Affairs  
North Carolina State University

# Overview

- Discuss mission statement development & review
- Describe program goals & objectives
- Discuss strategic choices

# Standard 1 | Manage the Program Strategically

**1.1 Mission Statement:** The program will have a statement of mission that guides performance expectations and their evaluation, including • its purpose and public service values, given the program’s particular emphasis on public affairs, administration, and policy • the population of students, employers, and professionals the program intends to serve, and • the contributions it intends to produce to advance the knowledge, research, and practice of public affairs, administration, and policy.

**1.2 Performance Expectations:** The Program will establish observable program goals, objectives and outcomes, including expectations for student learning, consistent with its mission.

**1.3 Program Evaluation:** The Program will collect, apply and report information about its performance and its operations to guide the evolution of the Program’s mission and the Program’s design and continuous improvement with respect to standards two through seven.

# Standard 1 | Rationale

- Accreditation standards reflect NASPAA's commitment to support programs for professional education that 1) commit to the public service values of public affairs, policy and administration and model them in their operations; 2) direct their resources toward quantitative and qualitative outcomes; and 3) continuously improve, which includes responding to and impacting their communities through ongoing program evaluation.
- The commitment to public service values distinguishes NASPAA-accredited programs from other degree programs. The expectation that the Program will:
  - Define and pursue a mission that benefits its community through education and disseminating knowledge about public affairs, administration and policy reflects NASPAA's commitment to public service values for example civic virtue, participatory processes and social equity;
  - Direct resources toward observable and measurable outcomes reflects NASPAA's commitment to public values of transparency and accountability;
  - Evolve and improve reflects NASPAA's commitment to public values of responsiveness and sustainability;
- In this way, NASPAA's accreditation process promotes public service values as the heart of the discipline.



# Standard 1 | Basis of Judgment

- **Standard 1.1**
  - The Program’s mission fits with its degree title (i.e., MPA, MPP, etc.)
  - The mission statement reflects values of public affairs, administration, and policy.
- **Standard 1.2**
  - The mission statement endorsed by the Program guides its activities.
- **Standard 1.3**
  - The basis of judgment is how well the Program’s mission and activities bear a clear and compelling relationship to a well-defined community of professionals outside of the University.

# Getting Started

# Vision Mission & Values

# Mission Statement | Realistic



**“That’s our new mission statement.”**

# Mission Development | Review Process



- Faculty
- Students
- Alumni
- Employers
- Internship Supervisors
- Advisory Council
- University Stakeholders

# Program | Goals/Objectives

<b>Specify Program</b>  <b>Goal</b>  As a result of the graduate degree program, our students ...	<b>Objectives</b>  In this graduate degree program, our students learned to ...
<b>VALUE</b>	1. Understand: _____ 2. Demonstrate: _____ 3. Apply: _____ 4. Analyze: _____ 5. Evaluate: _____
<b>KNOW</b>	1. Understand: _____ 2. Demonstrate: _____ 3. Apply: _____ 4. Analyze: _____ 5. Evaluate: _____
<b>CAN DO</b>	1. Understand: _____ 2. Demonstrate: _____ 3. Apply: _____ 4. Analyze: _____ 5. Evaluate: _____

# Before you leave ...

- Are your program goals consistent with the mission of your program?
- Do your goals align with public sector values and the vision for your program?
- In order to reach your goals and objectives, have you thought about how long it would take and what resources your program needs?
- Do your goals describe desired performance? In other words, are they SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely)?

# New Peer Examples!

- Georgia Southern University, MPA ([Assessment Plan](#))
- Northeastern University MPA ([Assessment Plan](#) and [Faculty Qualification Policies](#))
- University at Albany, SUNY, MPA ([Self-Study Report](#) and [Appendices](#))
- The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, MPA ([Assessment Plan](#))
- Victoria University of Wellington, MPM & MPP ([Diversity Plan](#))
- Virginia Commonwealth University, MPA ([Diversity Plan](#))

Source: <https://accreditation.naspa.org/2017/08/29/new-peer-examples/>

# Thank You

RaJade M. Berry-James, PhD  
Associate Professor  
School of Public and International Affairs  
Campus Box 8102  
Raleigh, NC 27695-8102  
Email: [rmberryj@ncsu.edu](mailto:rmberryj@ncsu.edu)  
Vmail: 919-515-5027





**Session 3A:**  
**10:20-11:20am**

# **Student Learning Assessment: Fundamentals**

RaJade M. Berry-James  
Associate Professor, School of Public and International Affairs  
North Carolina State University

# Overview

- Discuss assessment planning
- Discuss rationale, basic assumptions and basis of judgment for Standard 5.1
- Examine assessment cycle of student learning

# Assessment Planning

Keys to Assessment Planning	Important Questions
Assessment Methods	By what measure(s) will you know that students are meeting programmatic learning objectives?
	From whom, and at what points, will you gather data?
	How will you collect the assessment information?
Assessment Processes	When will you conduct the assessment?
	Who will be responsible for each component?
	What is the overall timeline for the assessment plan?
	How will your data be used to evaluate the program?
<p>Adapted from University of Massachusetts - Amherst. (n.d.) Program-Based Review and Assessment: Tools and Techniques for Program Improvement. Office of Academic Planning and Assessment. Retrieved from <a href="https://naspaaccreditation.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/program_based-umass.pdf">https://naspaaccreditation.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/program_based-umass.pdf</a>, pp.</p>	

# Standard 5.1 | Universal Required Competencies

As the basis for its curriculum, the Program will adopt a set of required competencies related to its mission and [to] public service values. The required competencies will include five domains, the ability:

- to lead and manage in public governance;
- to participate in and contribute to the public policy process
- to analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems and make decisions;
- to articulate and apply a public service perspective;
- to communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry.

# Standard 5 | Rationale

- Graduate level education should enable the student to demonstrate knowledge and understanding that is founded upon, extends, and enhances that typically associated with the bachelor's level, and provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and applying ideas.
- Graduate students should be able to apply their knowledge, understanding, and problem solving abilities in new or unfamiliar environments, and within broader or multidisciplinary contexts related to public affairs, administration, and policy.
- They should have the ability to deal with incomplete information, complexity, and conflicting demands. Graduate students should reflect upon social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgments.
- An accredited program should implement and be accountable for delivering its distinctive mission through the course of study it offers and through the learning outcomes it expects its graduates to attain. While all accredited degree programs must meet these standards, NASPAA recognizes that programs may have different missions with varying emphases.
- The curriculum should demonstrate consistency and coherence in meeting the program's mission. The program being reviewed should demonstrate how its curricular content matches the emphasis of its overall mission.

# Standard 5 | Basic Assumption

- NASPAA intends the accreditation process under the new standards to be developmental, that is, to advance the public esteem for all the degree programs it accredits as well as to improve the educational effectiveness of each degree program.
- Programs that provide accurate information on student learning and student attainment of required competencies will not be held to an ideal standard of perfection.
- Rather, programs will be expected to demonstrate that they understand the competencies expected of graduates, that they have instituted teaching and learning methods to ensure that students attain these competencies, and, where evidence of student learning does not meet program expectations, that action has been taken to improve performance.

# Standard 5 | Basis of Judgment

- It is expected that all students in degree programs accredited by NASPAA will have the opportunity to develop skills on each of the five universal required competencies.
- The program shows that it requires the five universal competencies of public affairs, policy and administration and links them to the program mission.
- The program defines each of the required competencies in terms of at least one student learning objective (but there may be more than one).
- The emphasis that a particular program places on each of these competencies is consistent with its mission.
- An accredited program need not assess all competencies every year or cohort, but rather at a frequency appropriate for its mission and goals.
- However, assessing each competency only once during a seven year accreditation cycle would not likely be sufficient for conformance in most programs.

# Assessment Plan

Goal Cited in Mission	Relevant Competency	Student Learning Outcomes	Where Is the Information Learned	Methods of Assessment	Individual(s) Responsible for Assessment Activities	Procedures for Using Assessment Results to Improve Program

Source: NASPAA Peer Assessment Plans, <https://accreditation.naspaa.org/resources/peer-examples/>



# One Assessment Cycle

- **Part C: How does the program use evidence about the extent of student learning on the required (or other) competencies for program improvement?**

## **Universal Required Competencies: One Assessment Cycle**

For the self-study narrative, the program should describe, for one of the required universal competencies, one complete cycle of assessment of student learning. That is, briefly describe 1) how the competency was defined in terms of student learning; 2) the type of evidence of student learning that was collected by the program for that competency, 3) how the evidence was analyzed, and 4) how the results were used for program improvement. *Note that while only one universal required competency is discussed in the self-study narrative, COPRA expects the program to discuss with the Site Visit Team progress on all universal competencies, subject to implementation expectations in COPRA's official policy statements.*

1. Definition of student learning outcome for the competency being assessed:

2. Evidence of learning that was gathered:

3. How evidence of learning was analyzed:

4. How the evidence was used for program change(s) or the basis for determining that no change was needed:

# Worksheet | Assessment Cycle of Student Learning

<b>Program Mission:</b>				
<b>Measurable Program Goal:</b>				
<b>Specific Program Objective:</b>				
<b>Student Learning Competency</b>	<b>Operational Definition Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Data Collection Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Analysis of Evidence Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Use of Evidence Student Learning Outcome</b>
<b>To lead and manage in public governance</b>				
To participate in and contribute to the public policy process				
To analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems and make decisions				
To articulate and apply a public service perspective				
To communicate and interact productively with a diverse and changing workforce and citizenry				

# Before you leave ...

- Are your assessment methods realistic, given your program realities?
- Do your program resources support your assessment processes?
- Have you identified an assessment committee?
- Did you charge the committee?

# Peer Assessment Plans

- [Binghamton University](#)
- [Eastern Kentucky University](#)
- [Georgia State University](#)
- [Georgia Southern University](#)
- [Indiana University, Bloomington](#)
- [Northeastern University](#)
- [The KDI School of Public Policy and Management \(Assessment Visual\)](#)
- [San Francisco State University](#)
- [Syracuse University](#)
- [The University of Georgia](#)
- [University of Minnesota](#)
- [University of North Texas](#)
- [The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#)
- [West Chester University](#)
- [Adapted Assessment Plan Self-Evaluation Tool](#)
- [Sample Assessment Plan Template](#)

Source: NASPAA Peer Assessment Plans, <https://accreditation.naspaa.org/resources/peer-examples/>

# Thank You

RaJade M. Berry-James, PhD  
Associate Professor  
School of Public and International Affairs  
Campus Box 8102  
Raleigh, NC 27695-8102  
Email: [rmberryj@ncsu.edu](mailto:rmberryj@ncsu.edu)  
Vmail: 919-515-5027



**Session 4AB:**  
**11:30am-12:30pm**

**Diversity and Climate of Inclusion:  
Planning and Strategies**

RaJade M. Berry-James  
Associate Professor, School of Public and International Affairs  
North Carolina State University

# Overview

- Connecting program mission to diversity objectives
- Identify components of diversity plan
- Identify program goals and strategic initiatives that promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness

# The Value in Accreditation

- Quality Assurance
- Process of Review
  - Voluntary Self-Assessment
  - External Peer Review
- Certification of Competency
- Continuous Improvement



# Standards | Cultural Competence

## **Faculty Performance | Diversity:**

- Promoting faculty diversity and a climate of inclusion through recruitment and retention

## **Serving Students | Diversity:**

- Promoting student diversity and a climate of inclusion through admissions, recruitment, & student support services

## **Learning Outcomes & Curricula Competencies:**

- Applied skills and knowledge to communicate, interact and serve diverse constituents; work productively in a global workforce

# Breakthrough Approaches

## Written Diversity Plans

- I**
- Consistent with the institution’s mission and vision
  - Aligns with institution’s strategic diversity initiatives
  - Addresses institutional dimensions of diversity

- P**
- Connects to core values of the field of study
  - Prepares students to communicate and interact productively with diverse and changing workforce
  - Identifies educational benefits of diversity
  - Affirms program commitment to diversity & equity

# Crafting | Written Diversity Plan

## I. Framing Diversity and Inclusion

- Mission, Vision, Diversity Core Values
- Dimensions of Diversity
- Committed Leadership
- Contextual Understanding

## II. Identifying Strategic Initiatives

- Planned Activity
- Responsible Person
- Status Update/Completion Date

## III. Emphasizing Goals

- Diverse Workforce
- Inclusive Workforce
- Outstanding Service/Impact

## IV. Monitoring Outcomes & Evaluating Impact

# Promoting | Cultural Competence

**Identify** solutions and simulations that engage students in showcasing essential knowledge, skills, abilities, awareness and attitudes (KSA<sup>3</sup>) through a variety of diverse learning and practical experiences.

**Mapping out plans** that ensure the learners' thinking and knowledge-based abilities connect to the program mission and instructional goals.

**Connecting Dimensions of Knowledge** with reflective knowledge, knowledge of self, and knowledge of outcomes.

# Where do we go from here?

## Program Compliance | Cultural Competence

- *Who* is responsible?
- *What* standards and criteria are to be applied?
- *When* is the plan expected to be completed?
- *Where* can professional competency be seen?
- *How* can potential benefits of cultural proficiency be tracked in the accreditation process?

# Before you leave ...

- Does your diversity plan create a diverse and inclusive workplace environment and culture of inclusion for faculty, students and staff?
- Do your program resources align with your efforts identified in your diversity plan?
- Does your plan have a designation of responsibility, for specific diversity efforts and initiatives?
- Do your strategic initiatives promote cultural knowledge, skills, abilities, awareness and attitudes that enable learners to become culturally competent?

# Peer Examples of Diversity Plans

- [Georgia State University](#)
- [John Jay College of Criminal Justice – CUNY](#)
- [North Carolina State University](#)
- [Syracuse University](#)
- [University of Colorado, Denver](#)
- [University of Minnesota](#)
- [University of Washington](#)
- [Victoria University of Wellington](#)
- [Villanova University](#)
- [Virginia Commonwealth University](#)

# Thank You

RaJade M. Berry-James

Associate Professor

School of Public and International Affairs

Campus Box 8102

Raleigh, NC 27695-8102

Email: [rmberryj@ncsu.edu](mailto:rmberryj@ncsu.edu)

Vmail: 919-515-5027



**Thank you to West Chester  
University for Lunch!**





**Session 5AB:**  
**1:45-2:50pm**

# **Fundamentals of Self-Study & Site Visit**

RaJade M. Berry-James  
Associate Professor, School of Public and International Affairs  
North Carolina State University

# Overview

- Discuss steps to prepare for the self-study year, self-study report, Site Visit
- Identify the documentation needed
- Prepare to assist the site visit team

# Preparing for the Self Study

- Wide-spread institutional support for (re)accreditation?
- Necessary data?
- Strategic processes?
- Student learning assessment?
- Workload plan – writing, editing SSR?
- Institutional approval and payment?

# Strategic Management Processes

- Mission review; logic model
  - Process for widespread involvement of stakeholders
- Strategic Plan not required but you will need to document program goals & public service values linked to your mission
  - What are they; how do you assess goal achievement?

# Student Learning Assessment

- Written Assessment Plan
- Define the 5 required Universal Competencies
- Assess at least 3 competencies
  - Gather Evidence
  - Analyze Evidence
  - Use Evidence to improve program, make changes or confirm program outcomes
- Confirm that you've closed the loop!

# Exercise

Worksheet: Preparing for the self-study year:  
Are you ready?

Take 3 minutes – work through the list and  
rate your program's readiness.

Go!

# Accreditation Process

- **August 15:** submit and lock the SSR
  - Civicore
  
- **October:** COPRA review
  
- **October – November:** Interim Report
  - COPRA liaison



# Accreditation Process

- **January:** program response to the Interim Report
  - Response not required but is a good idea
- **November-January:** Site Visit Team assembled
  - December-January: Site Visit dates set
    - Availability of university stakeholders

# Site Visit Team Meetings

- Program faculty, Adjunct faculty, Staff
- Students, Alumni
- Advisory Board(s)
- Chairs, Deans, Chief Academic Officer
- Career Counselors
- Internship Advisors, Internship Supervisors
- Other COPRA-requested meetings

# The Site Visit

- **A few weeks prior:** Site Visit Chair, Program Director agree on itinerary
  - Be prepared to be flexible
  
- **January – March:** Site Visit
  - Documents, records, EVIDENCE
  - SVT work space

# Accreditation Process

- **1 month after SV:** Chair posts draft report in Civicore
  - Programs may only correct errors of fact
- **1 – 2 months after SV:** final Site Visit Report loaded in NASPAA Data Center
  - Program response

# Accreditation Process

- **June:** COPRA Summer Meeting
  - Document review
    - SSR, Interim Report, response to IR, SVR, response to SVR
  - Liaison and “group of 3” make initial recommendation
  - Full Commission reviews, discusses, determines final action

# Final Action (Reaccreditation)

- Accredited 7\* years, no monitoring
- Accredited 7\* years with monitoring
- Accredited 1 year
  - Letter to program outlines areas of concern, nonconformance
  - Program must respond
  - Second SV (perhaps abbreviated) may be required
- Denial of Accreditation
  - \* 5 or 6 years if program has had a delay

# Final Action (Accreditation)

- Accredited 7 years, no monitoring
- Accredited 7 years with monitoring
- 1 or 2 year deferral
  - Letter to program outlines areas of concern, nonconformance
  - Program submits second Self-Study Report
  - Second Site Visit

# Questions on the Process?

- Take 5 minutes, talk at your table about your questions, worries, concerns ABOUT THE MECHANICS OF THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS
- Choose a spokesperson to report



# Self Study Reports

- [Binghamton University \(Appendices\)](#) (2013-14 cohort)
- [College of Charleston](#) (2013-14 cohort)
- [The University of Georgia](#) (2014-15 cohort)
- [The University of Texas at Austin \(Appendices\)](#) (2012-13 cohort)
- [University at Albany, SUNY \(Appendices\)](#) (2016-17 cohort)
- [University of Minnesota \(Appendices\)](#) (2013-14 cohort)
- [University of New Orleans \(Appendices\)](#) (2012-13 cohort)
- [University of Washington \(Appendices\)](#) (2013-14 cohort)

Source: NASPAA Peer Assessment Plans,  
<https://accreditation.naspaa.org/resources/peer-examples/>

# Logic Model Peer Examples

- [Binghamton University](#)
- [Indiana University, Bloomington](#)
- [Northern Illinois University](#)
- [The University of Georgia](#)
- [University of Missouri-St. Louis](#)
- [University of North Dakota](#) (full 2011 Self-Study Report available [here](#)).
- [West Chester University](#)
- [Willamette University](#)

Source: <https://accreditation.naspaa.org/resources/peer-examples/>

# Thank You

RaJade M. Berry-James, PhD

Associate Professor

School of Public and International Affairs

Campus Box 8102

Raleigh, NC 27695-8102

Email: [rmberryj@ncsu.edu](mailto:rmberryj@ncsu.edu)

Vmail: 919-515-5027

**Session 6ABC:  
3:00-4:00pm**

**Frequently Asked Questions  
&  
Participant Questions**

**Please join COPRA and your colleagues for a reception hosted by West Chester University in the Regency Foyer at 4:30pm!**

