NASPAA—*The Global Standard in Public Service Education*

1029 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-628-8965 ● Fax: 202-626-4978 ● Email: copra@naspaa.org

November 22, 2022

Raymond Jones
Department of Defense Management Acting Chair
Naval Postgraduate School

Dear Professor Jones,

The Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation (COPRA) has completed its initial examination of your Self-Study Report. We appreciate your efforts in reviewing your program mission and accomplishments and hope that this review has been beneficial to your program.

The Commission recommends your program proceed to a site visit. COPRA has determined that all site visits for the 2022-2023 accreditation review cohort will take place in-person.

For each program in the 2022-2023 Cohort, the COPRA initial examination raises questions or concerns about the conformity of programs with the NASPAA Accreditation Standards. The questions or concerns specific to your program are outlined in the attached Interim Report. Please read this report carefully so that you can respond to each of the points listed.

To facilitate the on-the-ground review, a Site Visit Team will be appointed. In visiting your program, the Site Visit Team will review your program mission and meet with program stakeholders, including faculty, students, alumni, and university administrators, as well as review pertinent program documents, including those related to program evaluation and student assessment. The team will be directed to address the items listed in the Interim Report and provide evidence to confirm and/or clarify information provided in the Self-Study Report. To prepare, please review the Site Visit Manual and other helpful resources on the NASPAA website.

A member of the Commission, Julie Olberding, has been designated to serve as liaison to your program. I urge you to contact your liaison via email at olberdingj@nku.edu to discuss any questions and concerns raised in the Interim Report and to answer any questions you may have about the process. As Chair of COPRA, I would also be pleased to respond to your questions about this letter or the review process at rhartley@ubalt.edu.

Please also submit your response to the specific points addressed in the enclosed Interim Report by uploading a single PDF file to the *Documents* tab in the NASPAA Data Center no later than either January 15, 2023 or 30 days before your confirmed site visit start date, whichever is earliest. NASPAA staff will contact your program shortly to begin the process of appointing your Site Visit Team. Your site visit dates should be finalized no later than January 15, 2023. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact Martha Bohrt, Chief Accreditation Officer at mbohrt@naspaa.org.

ATTACHMENT: Interim report: *response requested*

We look forward to working with you throughout the remainder of the accreditation cycle. Please do not hesitate to contact NASPAA staff or me if you have any questions.

With warmest regards,

Roger E. Hartley, Chair
Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation

COMMISSION ON PEER REVIEW AND ACCREDITATION

Interim Report
to the

Master of Science in Management
Naval Postgraduate School

November 22, 2022

The Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation has reviewed the Self-Study Report (SSR) for the Master of Science in Management program at Naval Postgraduate School. The Commission commends the program for strengths evident in the Self-Study Report and requests further information on the following points for its review. Particular attention should be paid to the items listed below during the Site Visit. Please relate any responses to the program's specific mission and goals.

Program Mission Statement (as reported in the SSR):

The Master of Science in Management (MSM) program prepares graduates for public service in management and leadership roles in the Defense establishments of the United States or allied nations. The program prepares graduates to manage in complex organizations and to conduct rigorous analyses of organizational problems, policies, and operations. To accomplish these goals, the program places particular emphasis on developing students' quantitative and analytical skills and their ability to model complex phenomena. (January 2014)

Item 1: Standard 1.1 – Mission Statement

Standard 1.1 states, "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 service,
- 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 service."

The Self-Study Report states, "In late 1998, the Department, having taken on the new name of Department of Systems Management, initiated a review of the mission statement, prompted by several changes in the previous six years. Again, after extensive faculty involvement, a modified departmental mission statement was adopted in August 1999. Except for a few minor word changes, that mission statement remained in effect until 2014."

The Commission seeks information regarding the 2014 process of evaluating and potentially updating the program's mission statement. The most recent mission review process outlined in the Self-Study Report was the one which happened in 1998. The Commission seeks additional information on the input of stakeholders in development and review of the program's mission. The Commission requests that the program discuss its strategies for directly involving students and alumni in ongoing review and evaluation of the mission in the future. Specifically, which stakeholders will be involved in the review? Will

employers and alumni be consulted, and if so, how will their feedback be used in the statement development and ongoing review?

The Site Visit Team is asked to further explore these questions and the role of stakeholders in the mission statement development and review with the program. How will ongoing input from stakeholders be used to monitor mission achievement? The Commission wants to ensure the program's mission is developed, and consistently reviewed, with input from program stakeholders.

Item 2: Standard 3.1 – Faculty Qualifications

Standard 3.1 states, "The program's faculty members will be academically or professionally qualified to pursue the program's mission."

In the self-study report, the program reports that 45% of courses delivering the required competencies are taught by nucleus faculty.

COPRA accepts as evidence that (for every location and modality) students are being taught by an adequate faculty nucleus who are engaged in the implementation of the program where:

- at least 50% of the courses delivering required competencies are taught by qualified nucleus faculty members employed by the institution.

The Commission requests that the Site Visit Team explore with the program plans to address COPRA's course coverage expectations. What are the plans of the program to reach 50 percent course coverage by nucleus faculty members for courses delivering the required competencies, as outlined in the Self-Study Instructions?

Item 3: Standard 4.4 - Student Diversity

Standard 4.4 states, "The program will promote diversity and a climate of inclusiveness through its recruitment, admissions practices, retention efforts, and student support services."

In table 4.4.3a of the Self-Study Report, the program reports that there were no Hispanic / Latina nor Asian women in Self-Study Year Minus 1 and in the Self-Study Year. The table also indicates that African American students made up less than 10% of the student population across the Self-Study Year Minus 1 and in the Self-Study Year.

The Self-Study Report states, "DDM/NPS does not recruit students, nor do we have direct influence on the diversity characteristics of students. Student diversity will depend significantly on the diversity characteristics of the wider Naval Services and Defense community."

In Appendix 4a the program also provides its Inclusion and Diversity (I&D) plan outlining a part of its purpose is to, "attract a diverse student body".

The Commission requests that the program discuss with the Site Visit Team its efforts to promote diversity, cultural awareness, and inclusiveness, including ongoing assessment and improvement. Do aspects of the program present obstacles to greater student diversity, such as the admissions process? Are there ways to raise awareness about limited student diversity with sponsors and encourage them to

consider candidates who would enhance it? These activities could be grounded in a larger goal of ongoing development of diverse leadership in the US Navy and related entities and supported by the strong diversity-based research and student projects being generated by the program.

The Commission seeks further information on how the program promotes and supports increased student diversity and a climate of inclusiveness, and requests that the Site Visit Team discuss with the program the questions and ideas presented in this section.

Item 4: Standard 5.1 – Universal Required Competencies

Standard 5.1 states, "As the basis for its curriculum, the program will adopt a set of required competencies determined by its mission and public service values. The required competencies will include five domains: the ability
   ● to lead and manage in the public interest
   ● to participate in, and contribute to, the policy process;
   ● to analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems and make evidence-informed decisions in a complex and dynamic environment;
   ● to articulate, apply, and advance a public service perspective;
   ● to communicate and interact productively and in culturally responsive ways with a diverse and changing workforce and society at large.

In the Appendix to Standard 5, the program states the following competencies:

   Our graduates will be:
   1. Critical thinkers
   2. Ethical leaders and persons of integrity
   3. Effective problem solvers in complex environments
   4. Effective and efficient managers of resources
   5. Effective communicators

The Commission seeks information regarding how the program competencies in Appendix 5 align with NASPAA's universal required competencies. Can the program provide a figure mapping or other visual to help the Commission understand the connections? For example, with which of the five universal required competency domains does the assessment described in 5.1 Part C align? The Basis of Judgement for Standard 5.1 states, "It is expected that all students in a NASPAA-accredited degree program will have the opportunity to develop knowledge and skills on each of the five universal required competencies. The program shows that it requires the five universal competencies of public and nonprofit affairs, policy and administration and links them to the program mission." The Site Visit Team should review these questions with the program.

Item 5: Standard 6.1 – Resource Adequacy

Standard 6.1 states, "The program will have sufficient funds, physical facilities, and resources in addition to its faculty to pursue its mission, objectives, and continuous improvement."

In last year's Self-Study Report, the Intro and Context document noted that the program was facing "significant budget and personnel cuts beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2022, mainly due to the loss of our EMBA program and the disestablishment of GSDM as a School." The program further noted, "The exact

amounts of the cuts remain unclear as of the SSR submission deadline, but we forecast that the impacts to the Defense-Focused MBA and the MSM programs will not be severe."

The Commission appreciates the program's transparency in terms of its budget related information. Based on the information provided, the Commission requests an update about the program's resource adequacy during this fiscal year and beyond to pursue its mission, objectives, and continuous improvement. The Site Visit Team should explore with the program strategies for the overall sustainability of the program, including how it ensures continuing to maintain the resources appropriate to pursue its mission in the short- and long-term.

Item 6: Standard 7.1 – Communications

Standard 7.1 states, "The program will provide appropriate and current information about its mission, policies, practices, and accomplishments—including student learning outcomes--sufficient to inform decisions by its stakeholders such as prospective and current students; faculty; employers of current students and graduates; university administrators; alumni; and accrediting agencies."

The Self-Study Report included URL links in Section 7.1.1 of the Self-Study Report as required. Some of the links do not appear to provide the information intended.

- <u>Length of Degree:</u> The webpage provided did not readily provide information on length of degree.
- <u>Distribution of Placement of Graduates:</u> This table only shows overall placement, which is 100%; that is, it doesn't indicate the sector(s). Even if it's 100% government military, then this should be transparent in the table.

The Commission requests the program provide the correct URLs and/or update the information on the webpages for each of the respective information prior to the site visit.

The Site Visit Team will be responsible for reviewing the program's evidence related to the written diversity plan. COPRA expects a diversity, equity and inclusion plan that links mission-based goals to measurable outcomes. The program should provide evidence regarding programmatic efforts to promote diversity, equity and a climate of inclusiveness, specifically demonstrable evidence of good practice, a framework for evaluating DEI efforts, and the connection to the program's mission and objectives.

The Site Visit Team will be responsible for reviewing the program's evidence related to student learning assessment. For the 2022-2023 Cohort, COPRA expects evidence of program completion of one full cycle of assessment for student learning outcomes in at least three of the universal competency domains. A "full cycle of assessment" means defining a student learning outcome, gathering evidence of learning, analyzing the evidence, and using the analysis to make programmatic decisions (COPRA Policy Statement, January 28, 2022).