2016 NACC ACCREDITATION SUMMIT

Transcription of Notes | July 12—14, 2016

Prepared by the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council

The **NACC** logo appears at the top of the page.

The 2016 NACC Accreditation Summit was held on July 12—14, 2016 at Texas A&M University

NACC is very grateful to the Sponsors and Participants who made this exciting event possible:

Sponsors:
Texas A&M University (Principal and Hosting Sponsor); The University of Texas at Austin (Leading Sponsor); Cleveland State University, and The Lilly Family School of Philanthropy at Indiana University (Sustaining Sponsors); Seton Hall University (Program Sponsor); Baruch College at the City University of New York, Seattle University, and the University of Oregon (Supporting Sponsors); and The Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership (JNE&L) (Contributing Partner)

Participants:
Jennifer Alexander, Robert Ashcraft, Signe Bell, Sylvia Benatti, Emiko Blalock, William Brown, Heather Carpenter, John Casey, Richard Clerkin, Joseph Cordes, Lisa Dicke, Norman Dolch, Jo Ann Ewalt, Maureen Emerson Feit, Mary Ann Feldheim, Robert Fischer, Jeffrey Greim, John Hailey, Matthew Hale, Kathleen Hale, Melissa Hall, Scott Helm, Mark Hoffman, Douglas Ihrke, Renee Irvin, Stuart Mendel, Roseanne Mirabella, Khanh Nguyen, Dorothy Norris-Tirrell, Laurie Paarlberg, Moira Porter, David Renz, Robbie Robichau, Patrick Rooney, Susan Schmidt, Shelly Schnupp, Daniela Schroeter, Elizabeth Searing, Steven Rathgeb Smith, David Springer, Marco Tavanti, Heather Troth, Teresa VanHorn, Erin Vokes, and Jennifer Wade-Berg.

Forward

The following compilation of notes was transcribed by Erin Vokes, Managing Director of the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council, during the NACC Accreditation Summit in July 2016. A good faith effort was made to accurately represent the reportings and discussions that took place during the Summit; however, the following content should not be considered direct quotes from Summit participants. Summit participants were offered the opportunity to review and revise these notes as needed in order to allow these notes to be as accurate as possible.

Summary of Topics and Presenters

Topic 1 | Nonprofit and Philanthropy First (or not)

- Stuart Mendel, *Cleveland State University*
- Patrick Rooney, *Indiana University*
- Steven Rathgeb Smith, *American Political Science Association*
- Jennifer Alexander, *University of Texas at San Antonio*

Topic 2 | Diversity and Critical Perspectives on Nonprofit Philanthropy Accreditation: Making sure all Voices are heard in the Process

- Angie Eikenberry, *University of Nebraska Omaha (contributing scholar absent)*
- Roseanne Mirabella, *Seton Hall University*
- Maureen Emerson Feit, *Seattle University*
- Emiko Blalock, *Michigan State University*
- Khanh Nguyen, *University of San Francisco*

Topic 3 | Approaches to Accreditation: What Can We Learn from the Current Processes of Accreditation?

- Heather L. Carpenter, *Notre Dame of Maryland University*
- Susan Schmidt, *Nonprofit Leadership Alliance*
- Norman A. Dolch, *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership*

Topic 4 | Sandbox Sharing: Nonprofit and Philanthropy Accreditation in the Context of Existing Accreditation Organizations

- David Renz, *University of Missouri, Kansas City*
- Kathleen Hale, *Auburn University*
- David Springer, *University of Texas at Austin*
- Robert Ashcraft, *Arizona State University*

Topic 5 | International Accreditation

- Erin Vokes, *Cleveland State University*
- John Casey, *Baruch College, City University of New York*
- Marco Tavanti, *University of San Francisco*
- John Hailey, *City University of London (contributing scholar absent)*

Topic 6 | The NACC Accreditation Process: A Work in Progress

- Renee Irvin, *University of Oregon*

Topic 1 | Nonprofit and Philanthropy First (or not)

TOPIC 1 | Presenter: S. Mendel, 7/13/16

I. Ways to strengthen NACC

- Increase membership
- Legitimize field

II.

1. Self-assess (areas/indicators of quality)
2. NACC certifies
3. Dashboard/numerical ratings
   - 0= No, 1= Yes, 2= Yes, very strongly

III. Good governance

- Board composition

  =Volunteerism

   - VIP (Very important pedagogy!)

IV. We affirm it (the field of NP); not wait for world to bestow it

TOPIC 1 | Presenter: P. Rooney, 7/13/16

1. Rankings and endowments
2. Philanthropy AND nonprofit first
3. More Americans give than vote
   (Philanthropy seems more important behaviorally)
4. Rapid growth of field (seen by increase in programs and increase in journals)
5. Accreditations follow certification
6. Costs/benefits of accreditation
7. Within NASPAA, rankings and other opportunities that could be addressed
8. Field will evolve but we need to start somewhere—let's start here and now

PAGE 3

TOPIC 1 | Presenter: S. Smith, 7/13/16

- Many forms of training options available within frame of nonprofit field (and diverse mix of programs)
    - Beneficial to students to give order/ranking to options, and to increase quality/standard of programs

- **Integrated** model of NPM education
    - (evolution: demand for course→program→specialization/concentration)
    - Focus on integrating content/curriculum into core curriculum (as opposed to isolation of NP content)

- Hybridity has greatly increased (e.g. public-private; public-public; public-gov't) (public-driven based on public need)
    - Better outcomes regardless of sector

- Integrated approach reflects what's happening on the ground and the **career trajectory** of students in NP field
    - Allows adaptation re curriculum
    - Accreditation runs opposite to integrated approach and mismatched with movement of where accreditation process is going
    - NACC indicators of quality and curriculum = input focused
    - NASPAA now more outcome based assessment process (e.g. learning competencies trying to achieve)
    - Politics of NACC Accreditation are concerning/risky; costly
    - False implication of implicit relationship of public service and government

TOPIC 1 | Presenter: J. Alexander, 7/13/16

- NP cert/degree programs need support of development of emerging fields
  - "accreditation-like;" e.g. certification
    - → Less expensive; could segue into official accreditation

- Certification is critical to legitimize; forward-thinking; ongoing articulation of future of field

  i. NP academic needs to be the focus
    - Students
    - Blurring
    - Multisectoral workforce

  ii. Degrees/certs are underfunded; MPA courses overload, need more institutional support
    - Faculty knowledge of NP topics
    - MPA program grows but insufficient support for NP issues specifically

☼ **Certification and credentialing gives support / <u>leverage</u>**

- MPA gives an incomplete picture of NP; doesn't address relationship between historic NP and public service

- Too much focus on **<u>managemen</u>**t rather than public service/sector, government, governance…

☼ **Asymmetric between NP & PA. PA/NASPAA should not be representing the NP field.**

TOPIC 1: GENERAL DISCUSSION

Q1. **(M. Hoffman): Term "accreditation" is more recognized/fundable. Would "certification" get buy-in/funding from universities?**

1.1 (J. Alexander): Need a way to coordinate with NASPAA? People would want both…?

1.2 (S. Mendel): Fragmentation of field holds us back (albeit rich field of scholarship).

→ Need structure to fund these things and argument to validate.

1.3 (P. Rooney): Philanthropy v. gov't = not at all the same (or related). Philanthropy = beautiful; gov't = not. Philanthropy = smaller, nimble, creative, innovative, exploratory. New ideas and way to test ideas (e.g. Gates Foundation efforts v. gov't efforts).

→ Philanthropy and government are not substitutions and have different missions.

1.4 (R. Mirabella): "Gov't schools": Steve = cautionary tale. Dispelling the notion of "gov't bad"

→ "communities-first"

1.5 (S. Smith): Social innovation/social enterprise. Accreditation runs counter to that.

→ How to certify gov't related programs / diverse programs.
→ What are we certifying?

1.6 (J. Alexander): Certification = mission-driven. Some form of legitimation.

1.7 (N. Dolch): Students making contributions to society after graduation.

→ Who is advocate at university?

1.7.i (S. Smith): NP related topics/programs… content integrated into curriculum, as a goal to move toward effort to recognize some courses relate more than others. NP involved in evaluation now.

1.8 (P. Rooney): Re economics: market failures and relationship of public goods. Gov't does play an important role. Why not vote? E.g. national defense—no role in philanthropy.

→ NP/public/private can help public needs better than gov't.

TOPIC 1: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

Q2. (J. Casey): What <u>models</u> of academic discipline could be applied to NP certification/accreditation?

2.1 (J. Alexander): Credentialing the curriculum

- → So diverse as a field. Needs to be considered by group.
- → Mission-driven.

2.2 (S. Smith): **<u>Certification</u>**. Governance. Ethical principles. Minnesota Association of NP.

- → Self-regulating.
- → Move toward **<u>outcome-based</u>** approach.

3. (D. Renz): Powerful generative stage in the process.

- → Outcome—understanding more fully the breadth of this process. Complex.
- → Lester Salamon—systemic clarity to NP sector across the globe; singular way to describe it.
- → Will keep evolving and changing. But we have an impact—may stifle evolution and development. Are cooperatives included?
- → E.g. "School of management"—(1) Leadership;--(2) Management; --(3) Governance. (Non-sectoral)
- → What are we putting a box around? Isomorphism + legitimacy.
- ☼ A structure for compliance before we know what we're complying to?
- → No singular thing we're protecting. Why are we—(1) NOT gov't? –(2) NOT profit?

4. (R. Irvin): Integration requires humility.

- → This notion not incorporated into business schools.
- → Integration vital for some sectors and not others
- → What are the outcomes for fraudulent programs? Lack of outcomes will drag the field down.
- ☼ A process (regardless of terminology) is needed.

TOPIC 1: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

Q5. **(M. Hale): Integration good in theory, but in practice? Until there is accreditation, NP will always be the lesser "step child." How does partnership/integration happen?**

5.1 (S. Smith): *A.* In an integrated world, things still get left out:

- Given NP evolution (w/respect to other entities/sectors) there is a body of material that needs to be taught to nonprofit leaders.
- Transformation in the sector—leads away from guidelines
    - → Focus on a variety of skills needed to manage an organization in a complex/changing world
    - → Need to learn skills that are not unique to NP sector

5.2 (J. Alexander): *A.* PA programs focus on internal rather than external (e.g. networking)

5.3 (S. Mendel): *Re inputs v. outputs*: Right now, inputs are important.

- → What are we building a fence around?
- ☼ **Need to define field first** **before we can know what kind of outcomes we're looking for.**

5.4 (R. Ashcraft): *Q.* Not binary. Integrated across entire university?

> **5.4.i.** (P. Rooney): *A.* **Every student in every discipline should learn something about philanthropy.**
>
> - → Important for all; something there that can be studied.
> - → Many students will have multiple careers (avg. person has 7 jobs in lifetime)

5.5 (R. Gerkin): *Q.* Are we creating a silo that doesn't exist?

5.6 (H. Carpenter): *Q.* How to integrate re different programs?—so diverse/nuanced/cross-sector. Will be unique to each program/dept.

- → Co-teaching?
- → Students now want cross-sectoral

5.7 (D. Schroeter): *Q.* How to evaluate, if integrated? Integration is important due to cross-sectoral. How to achieve collective impact.

TOPIC 1: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

Q6. **(L. Dicke): What benefits to educational field through this process? Re Accreditation:**

- → **What are the benefits?**
- → **What are we hoping to accomplish?**

6.1 (P. Rooney): *A.*

1. Establishment of minimal standards
2. Rankings inform students. Rankings are valued. 3rd party validation that says there's value added. Verification of quality program.
3. Will result in outputs.
4. Helpful re internal budget. Accreditation budget. Higher rankings appeal to donors.
5. Recruiting new people to NACC. Delineates barriers to entry. Legitimizes program.

6.2 (M. Hale): *A*. Teaching students meaningful/quality NP education will improve the world (more effective leaders in NP field → greater social impact)

6.3 (D. Springer): *A.*

1. Curriculum delivery. Accreditation drives curriculum. Takes decision about how to shape curriculum out of faculty (will this—(1) *enhance* Or—(2) *tarnish* curriculum?)
2. Student-centered

6.4 (M. Feldheim): *A.*

1. Reduces fraudulent programs
2. Legitimizes quality programs / gives validity to education product
3. Carves out what it means to have a quality program

Q7. **(E. Searing): (Knowledge Gap) Accrediting bodies typically accredit *degrees*.**

- → **Is there a body that accredits concentrations?**
- → **Can we certify things at that smaller level?**

7.1 (Collectively): *A*. No.

7.2 (D. Renz): *A.* NASPAA + others are starting to have these conversations.

7.3 (P. Rooney): *A*. Certificates within programs somewhat address this.

7.4 (S. Smith): *A*. Field diverse, integrated, mismatched. Model of separate degree program. World moving away from this approach.

7.5 (K. Hale): *A*. It is possible under NASPAA guidelines, but not fully realized.

7.6 (H. Carpenter): *A*. Sub-degrees/standalones.

Topic 2 | Diversity and Critical Perspectives on Nonprofit Philanthropy Accreditation: Making sure all Voices are heard in the Process

TOPIC 2 | Presenter: R. Mirabella, 7/13/16

1. Professionalization and managerialism
   - Evolution: Liberal → Professional
     - → professional favors economical approach over civil society/mission-driven

2. Human rights

   - Shift: Activists → Professionals

3. Consequences of accreditation (re AACSB)

   - Leaves out empathy; need for ambiguity (not fitting into nice little boxes)
   - Hard science v. experience from the field (& day-to-day)
   - Qualitative is hard to quantify (e)

4. Negative impact on life in university

   - Dramaturgical compliance: false face v. what's really happening
   - Threatens shared governance.

5. "Mission-based approach to accreditation:" issues

   - Based on organizational survival

6. An alternative approach to accreditation is recommended

   - Accreditation will stabilize oppressive systems
   - Prepare students for critical thinking and social change efforts
   - Reframe and challenge authoritative structures
   - Advance interdisciplinarily

PAGE 10

TOPIC 2 | Presenters: M. Feit, K. Nguyen, & E. Blalock, 7/13/16

1. Gap between diverse representation within NP Orgs

- Diverse = "demographic mix of people"
- Inclusion: degree participate
- Equity: justice, impartial, fairness (distribution of resources) (income disparity)

+ Generational disparity

→ Social justice; decrease marginalization

2. Faculty: duty to figure out how to teach students how to live in the world today

3. Accreditation is useful but inadequate to address concerns of marginalization, inclusion, diversity, & equality

- Resources + legitimacy (+ quality + institutionalization)
- Institutionalization: sustainability of program / succession planning

→ What is legitimate? What is quality? What to institutionalize?

4. Critical Race Theory (CRT) (challenge the status quo): Include views of marginalized people in academia.

→ Culture of silence and fear
→ Valid forms of knowledge

5. Deficiencies accreditation currently offers but can provide:

1. Oppressive structures: uncover exclusionist structures & practices

→ Ensure students feel welcome (gender, race)
→ Look around campus—what practices that are taken for granted that marginalize (you don't know what you don't know)

2. Step beyond interdisciplinarily—look beyond US; look beyond US scholarship; beyond sectors

6. If move forward w/Accreditation: diversity and inclusion needs to be at the center

- Accreditation is a dull instrument—need to go further—it's limiting/not enough
- Start w/humility and self-awareness (not something you can institutionalize)
- Be aware of limits: inefficient, will take time. Can't wait.
- Resources: accreditation will increase rigidity—must challenge, not compromise.
- ☼ **Won't be legitimate unless it's diverse.**

TOPIC 2: GENERAL DISCUSSION

1.0 (R. Ashcraft): Blend of professionality with social change and critical analysis?

1.1 (R. Mirabella):

→ Neo-liberalism curriculum teaches things that are easily quantified. E.g. logic models (gov't & foundation)
→ We don't know how to measure the depth of what we do (esp in communities/social change)
→ Neo liberalism and professionalism dominate
→ What do we accredit? Curriculum that finds balance?
→ What is the essence of NP management?

1.2 (R. Ashcraft): This exists already sort of…

1.3 (M. Feit):

→ How is this language racialized? Professionalism is racialized in itself.
→ Why are these conversations not happening collectively?
→ May come from different disciplinary lens?
→ Who is engaged in this thinking?
→ Board Members tell them our best practices.

1.4 (D. Renz):

→ Problem with concept of "Best Practices."
→ Re forced reliance on hard science: paradigm shift
→ Inherent in structure, or structure outcome?

1.5 (R. Mirabella):

→ Hard science is required for research to be legit/valid/accepted
→ Qualitative is less visible
→ In practice—conservative, homogeneous, "American" (even though it was intended to be mission-focused). Very US-lens, but it's an international phenomenon
→ Field is quantitative & measurement focused (threatened by outcome measurement and institutionalization) (+funders)

TOPIC 2: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

1.6 (S. Mendel):

- A clean sheet approach
- CRT = great values to guide our approach
- Existing models for accreditation don't fit—let's start from scratch (don't borrow a broken model)
- Inputs + outputs
- Career-track focus; where field is headed
- Nonprofit **studies**, not just management
- Needn't be arduous, costly, or offensive
- Reflect nature of field
- "Nonprofit-First Nature"
    - → Incubator for social innovation
    - → Flexible

1.7 (M. Hale):

- Show how students reframe and challenge authority structures
- Build it into process
- Accountability and consensus—practical mechanisms

1.8 (R. Mirabella): **Start with Curricular Guidelines**

1.9 (M. Hale): How?

1.10 (M. Feit):

- Leadership is coming from the top. Integrate it into every conversation about accreditation.
- Work not left to small group of people who will be ignored.

1.11 (S. Smith):

- Movement toward professionalism, logic models, output focus—has helped the field/impacted
- Diversity is critical in NASPAA
    - → Focus on improving representation of underrepresented
- **Diversity as a social change** v. "recruiting diverse representatives"

1.12 (M. Feit):

- "Adding faculty" is not enough
- Requires change in perspective
- CRT as a lens

TOPIC 2: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

1.13 (E. Blalock): Where and how knowledge is shaped

- Only dominant theoretical structures are offered; does students a disservice
- Need to provide a whole array (rare qualitative) plus quantitative

1.14 (K. Nguyen): Best intent ≠ positive impact on community

- CRT ~ narratives that may not be "legitimized" according to US perspective (esp w/students working w/minorities)

1.15 (R. Mirabella): Quality assurance = loss of admin budget

→ Focus on paperwork
→ How does this (system) make lives better
→ 'Efficiency mechanisms' don't improve quality of life

1.16 (J. Ewalt):

- Rhetoric. Public services. Improvement of field stems in interdisciplinary nature.
  → NASPAA hasn't grasped that focus ought to be on public service (not PA)
- Accreditation process: mission-based → curriculum based
  → Values, goals, work, demonstration of impact === ties back to curriculum
  → Process has potential
- Diversity + inclusion ~ how is plan actualable; how to measure impact/reality of it
  → It's a learning process.
- = Accreditation is not stationary. It evolves as it learns. Doesn't have to be the obstacle. COPRA has agonized over these issues. Beyond faculty.

1.17 (S. Helm): Not whether accreditation is good or bad; the process it takes.

- Structures v. values embedded within the structure
  → Structures are neutral; it's the values that make the structure good or bad
- NP managers want to help their communities: they want to know how to manage and fund them without sacrificing their values.
- = maintain without encroachment
- = strengthen communities through strong epistemological programs
- NP is legitimized; need to give it more credit

1.18 (P. Rooney): We're at the front end of this process and we can be mindful of diversity as a core value.

→ Antithesis of neoliberalism
- Add methodological diversity (case study, ethnographic history), philosophical and ideological diversity. Hear alternative views.

TOPIC 2: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

1.19 (D. Schroeter): More of a methodological debate (e.g. NASPAA—self-study, evaluation models and lenses)

1.20 (M. Feldheim):

- How do we professionalize field of philanthropy and nonprofit management?
  - → Code of ethics, code of conduct, values…
    - → The umbrella under which everything else is discussed
- Values: flexible, adaptable, use critical thinking (conduct), benevolence, stewardship (ethics)
- NP sector is ripe for being taken advantage of / abused

= What do we value and how does this translate into our process?

1.21 (J. Wade-Berg):

- Duty to ensure students graduate and get jobs
- Do start w/blank slate; allow all voices
- We as a body need to believe in what we're teaching and doing
- There has been change (but change doesn't happen overnight)
- "Representative" is different than actual environment of the field
  - → Complex conversation (which might be uncomfortable)
- ☼ **Culture Competence (as opposed to CRT)**
  - → There is a lag between outcomes
- Allow place to allow universities to have **their** values and **their** outcomes
  - → Influence this / enable construct
  - → Don't lock people in box—allow them to innovate their own curriculum

Topic 3 | Approaches to Accreditation: What Can We Learn from the Current Processes of Accreditation?

TOPIC 3 | Presenter: H. Carpenter, 7/13/16

Accrediting Bodies:

Business

- AACSB ("flexible;" allows schools to determine)
- ACBSP (prescriptive; CPC-numerical based on credit hours)
- = Re NACC: standalone programs or concentrations (based on Curricular Guidelines, e.g.)

Public Admin

- NASPAA
- = Re NACC: "course coverage" rubric

Social Work

- CSWE ("learning outcomes")
- = Re NACC: map NACC Curricular Guidelines to course syllabi, learning objectives, and assignments (standalone & specializations)

☼ **Re NACC—Experiential Education Coverage (NASPAA + CSWE utilize this)**

PAGE 16

TOPIC 3 | Presenter: S. Schmidt, 7/13/16

I. Core components of CNP credentials

II. Outcomes = CNPs 7x more likely to rise to the top (good jobs + good positions/promotions)

III. Competency-based design/approach

- ⊗ Not courses or credit hours
- ⊗ Not degree offerings or profession tracks
- ✓ Based on competency/skills needed
    - → Organized into 10 competencies
    - → Polled employers = what skills do you want?
        - → Then teach these things
- • "mapping across programs"
    - → Web-based curriculum map
    - → Every CNP has a minimum standard before entering workforce
        - o Course work
        - o Internships/experiential
        - o Etc.
- • Self-assessed by student; verified by faculty

- = **Everyone Wins**

Students

- • Students prepared through coursework, experiential, writing for grad apps, interviewing
- → Learning outcome level

Employers

- • Instructed, assessed, and applied
- → Removes jargon for employer

Universities

- • Enhanced pedagogy + curriculum
- → Engaged
- → Aligned w/trends

IV. Limitations

- • Structural differences across institutions
- • Product must be value added to get buy-in
- • Implementation is costly (esp time)   *Benefits/Costs*

TOPIC 3 | Presenter: N. Dolch, 7/13/16

I. What's crucial about accreditation isn't how academy looks at it, but external stakeholders (local gov't, parents, NPs…)

II. Employers of NP don't require people to have NP degree

- **Most NPs want people with certain types of <u>skills</u> rather than certain types of <u>degrees</u>**
- Large NPs at times have their own in-house training programs
- Many NPs use consultants (or private research firms, or universities)
  - → Based on track record or reputation
  - → National NPs will seek groups with national reputations

III. Academic Programs

- Would accreditation impact undergrad's decision?
- What about graduate program?
- Would you, as an employer, only hire students from accredited institutions?
- As academic society, do we want to create exclusionary programs?

IV. Certificate Programs

- People in certificate programs, advancing skills
- What level matters (local, national)?

V. Foundations

- Would accreditation become mandatory for funding eligibility?

☼ = **Unintended outcomes must be considered**

VI. Businesses

- How would accreditation be looked at by for-profit businesses?
- Would they prefer accredited or not?
- Licensing?

☼ = **Importance of services attached**

TOPIC 3 | Presenter: N. Dolch, 7/13/16—CONTINUED

VII. Government

- Would programs get pulled if not accredited?
- Would it limit NP programs only to universities with funding to go through accreditation?

VIII. Accountability

- Employment of students/graduates
- Will accreditation make taking student loans/time worth it?

IX. Potential Donors

- Will accreditation make them more passionate about the program?
- (Or is it the impact it has on the community?)

X. Media

- Does NACC want to take on the risk?
- Accountability— Accredited programs will represent the field. Are they good representatives?

Conclusion

- Unnecessary hurdles
- Excludes good students
- Costs may allow only wealthy schools

≠ Accredited students more eligible

≠ Preference for funding

≠ Enhanced opportunities for business relations

≠ Donor interest

TOPIC 3: GENERAL DISCUSSION

Q1. **(S. Mendel): What is the purpose of accreditation (in terms of creating a structure)?**

→ **Students to get jobs?**
→ **Research/scholarship?**

1.1 (H. Carpenter): *A*. Will provide legitimacy to the field (drawing on NACC Curricular Guidelines)

1.2 (S. Schmidt): *A*. Knowing that when every CNP goes out into the world, they will be legitimate / provide a legitimate service (accommodate everybody)

1.3 (R. Ashcraft): *A*. Reveal factors of quality in NP program

1.4 (S. Schmidt): *A*. Student-focused (they certify the student, not the program/institution).

→ (a) student learning; (b) getting jobs

1.5 (N. Dolch): *A*. Matrices via Heather's structure (re programs) + Susan's structure (re quality learning)

= Quality structure + quality learning
= How to ensure this and demonstrate it to others?
• Focus on quality of teaching and learning; so we can say to students, parents, advisory boards: 'this is what happens in our program' with some assurance.

1.6 (R. Ashcraft): It's a lot about outcomes

Q2. **(S. Smith): Problem of legitimacy is a fallacy. NP programs are successful/the field is a success. Why don't 'we' view it as a success/why viewed as not legitimate?**

2.1 (H. Carpenter): *A*. Depends on how you define 'legitimate:'

→ MPA remains because ti is accredited
→ Ranking ≠ Quality
→ It's about high quality learning outcomes throughout the program

---

1.7 (R. Irvin): *A*. Need for more (international) students

→ Want students to come to 'our accredited institution' rather than a program that is not.

2.2 (M. Hale): *A*. Yes it's a success, but it's moving away from us (e.g. consultants outside the field)

TOPIC 3: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

2.3 (M. Hoffman): *A*. There is student demand for quality nonprofit and philanthropic programs.

→ Money will shift to support our programs
→ Mark the truly legitimate programs interested in nonprofit and nonprofit students
→ NASPAA gave PA legitimacy. PA dominates. NP is always second. Resources go to dominate program.

PAGE 20

1.8 (??): Competency-based. Designed/customized on own. Individual focus helps fill the gap.

1.9 (S. Schmidt): When thinking about outcomes, this (above statement) is critical.

--

Q3. (S. Helm): Are there truly programs out there that are not legitimate?

3.1 (R. Irvin). A. Yes. People will add 2-3 "nonprofit-related" courses and call it a master's degree.

--

1.10 (M. Feldheim): "Competency-based"

→ Could test out of things so accrediting body perceived this in a negative light.
→ Different interpretations of definition and how it's used.

1.11 (S. Schmidt): Competency based "curriculum" vs. "design." Distinction is key.

2.4 (P. Rooney): Excess demand for people knowledgeable in the field (plus reputation)

1.12 (P. Rooney):

→ Economically—lots of accrediting going on. So it does matter. Why would accrediting happen if this wasn't important?
→ Other accrediting bodies didn't always exist either.

Q4. (R. Mirabella): Who's in and who's out?

4.1 (H. Carpenter): *A.* The question is: Who is participating in this process / thoughtfully analyzing their curriculum?

Topic 4 | Sandbox Sharing: Nonprofit and Philanthropy Accreditation in the Context of Existing Accreditation Organizations

TOPIC 4 | Presenter: D. Renz, 7/13/16

- More than one accrediting body for business schools:
    1. AACSB: very prestigious and only awarded to 5%
        → Operates within larger body—accrediting body for accrediting bodies: NACIQI (advises the US Secretary of Education)
    2. AACSB: business and accounting. Institutional and specialized (accredits institutions; discipline-specific). Global in scope.
        → NPM **is** on their radar.
        → Expense = $20,000 plus ancillary costs
            o $5400 business
            o $8700 business + accounting
- **AACSB Criteria**
    → Well-defined, established entity
    → Adhere to standards*
    → Resources

- ***Categories of Standards**

1. Strategic Management & Innovation (including mission emphasis)

    → Impact theory, practice, and teaching
    → Publishing; faculty engagement

2. Students, faculty, & staff

    → Policies and procedures
    → Faculty management and communications

3. Learning & Teaching

    → Documented and systematic
    → Learning outcomes and measurements thereof
    → Appropriate curricula

4. Academic & Professional Engagement

    → Executive education
    → Strategically employs educational and professional engagement

TOPIC 4 | Presenter: D. Renz, 7/13/16—CONTINUED

- **Focuses on:** Faculty, key staff support, institutional systems
  - → Faculty: 40% must be scholarly; Key staff support: -40% adjunct

- **Compared to NASPAA:**
  - → NASPAA = degree focus
  - → AACSB = school / program + services

- **CHEA (Council on Higher Education) Recognition:**

  Must haves:

  - → Demonstrate and advance quality education
  - → Encourage improvement
  - → Demonstrate accountability
  - → Self-evaluation & site-team visit
  - → *Additional bullet points not captured*

TOPIC 4 | Presenter: K. Hale, 7/13/16

☼ **NASPAA**
→ Mission driven
→ Outputs > Inputs
→ Self-assessed / self-determining

- Offers a Frame, although it's less prepared to address philanthropy

- Can be a willing host
  → It's a professional accrediting body/proves
  → Structured around a 'developmental approach'
    o Help programs learn how to be better at what they do
    o Not punitive. Time-consuming.
  → Peer-reviewed
    o Caveat: pre-supposes academically/professionally qualified to know what's going on
  → "Modest" in terms of resources they require (debatable); Resource constraints not the most limiting (debatable)*
    o *It *is* real and significant

- Have to support a systematic review that focuses on outcomes
  → Why do you have the curriculum that you do and what does it accomplish?
  → Shape by inertia; people who 'get it' or not
  → Not a blank slate—takes a long time to change

- Essential to work to unify faculty in our field
  → Common vision
  → Public service mission
  → Advocate to open up space for the amount of time it will take
    o Give faculty time to think and have a conversation
    o To entirely reshape our curriculum
    o Actively reboot our understanding of public service

TOPIC 4 | Presenter: D. Springer, 7/13/16

☼ **CSWE**

- **Philanthropy:**
  - → Civic + social work (public + private)
  - → Effort to improve conditions in society, reduce stress
  - → Charity, education, justice

- EPAS four features of integrated curriculum:
  - → Program mission & goals
  - → Explicit curriculum
  - → Implicit curriculum
  - → Assessment

  - → *Competency-Based (but can't test out)*
    - o What students should be taught
    - o Competency-based; not static
    - o Knowledge, value, skills
    - o Can add additional

    1. Ethical / professional
    2. Diversity
    3. Advance human rights
    4. Research…
    5. Engage policy practice

- Field education centric to social work
  - → Clinical / therapy
  - → Community organizing

- Implicit:
  - → Diversity
  - → Admin structures
  - → Faculty quality and quantity
  - → Resources

☼ *Assessment: Not about every benchmark*
  - → Sense of data
    - o Gathering, collecting, analyzing
  - → Student performance
  - → How you adapt/adjust based on the above

TOPIC 4 | Presenter: D. Springer, 7/13/16—CONTINUED

- Accreditation does matter
  - → Can't get license from non-accrediting body

  $20,000 site visit + (3 years):

  - ○ Mission competencies—Y1
  - ○ Assessment Plan—Y2
  - ○ Full blown program perfected according to standards—Y3

- Cost + Time

- Publishers want textbook authors to map back to competencies (may infringe on intellectual freedom)
  - → Standardized rubrics that relate back to competencies

- Benefits of SW Accreditation
  - → Peer review of curriculum holds to level of accountability
  - → Reputability
  - → Assessment data cultivates culture of continual improvement

☼ *Can we do this without 'accreditation'?*

☼ *Remain student-centered*

TOPIC 4 | Presenter: R. Ashcraft, 7/13/16

- Where do stand-alone programs fit in?

- Cohesive framework to assess Quality:
  - → NACC is the right organizer / driver
    - o No one else is the right fit
  - → Curricular Guidelines
  - → Home for stand-alone programs like ours

- BENEFITS of accreditation
  - → Size/scale of programs—is of interest
  - → Relevance (to real community / social issues)
  - → We're outside the shackles
  - → We have the basic tools to advance
  - → Born from the nonprofit-philanthropy-first mantra

- What constitutes quality programs?
  - → A field driven by quality standards

- *Wine metaphor:* Standards of quality = outstanding product
  = Whether you would recommend it to the consumer
  (Included a public event—"between the vines")

- What's aspirational

- Allowance for innovation in face of compliance

- ☼ ***Philanthropy-nonprofit-first framework***

TOPIC 4: GENERAL DISCUSSION

Q1. **(S. Mendel):**

- **Transparent, self-reporting tool.**
- **What NACC does v. what is needed?**
  - → **So what? Why's it needed?**
  - → **If we don't do it, will someone else?**
  - → **Is it important / should we do it?**
- **Accreditation might be the wrong word, but there is a need.**
- ☼ *NASPAA?*

1.1 (K. Hale): *A.* NASPAA would probably support it.

1.2 (S. Mendel): **Q.** Will someone do it if NACC doesn't?

1.3 (R. Ashcraft):

- → The people that come to the table are the ones to make it happen.
- → Aspirational way to elevate the field.
- → NACC wants to be a part of the process.

1.4 (D. Springer): Should we pursue 'it'? Rather—what are the ways we can enhance NP programs for students? What is the correct path?

1.5 (D. Renz):

- → Accreditation is a tool. For what? Somethings better than others (don't' use a screwdriver as a hammer).
- → Accreditation is not the right tool for what we're trying to address.
- → But if NACC does it, we can protect the space.
- → **Q.** Should NACC do it to address stand-alones, or the whole field?

1.6 (R. Ashcraft): *A.* Whole field.

1.7 (D. Renz): Crate a structure that defends stand-alone and whole field at same time.

1.8 (J. Casey):

- → Would the process be different for stand-alone v. whole field?
- → How process works for all. We're not all one. Some of us are 'by-products'

1.9 (M. Hale): All/stages/process—discussion will be ongoing

TOPIC 4: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

T2. (J. Ewalt): Similarities between accrediting bodies' processes

- Therefore, NACC's processes will ultimately be comparable (whether it wants to or not)
- → Mission/outcome-driven
- → Nonprofit/philanthropy-specific

2.1 (K. Hale): Evaluators must understand what we do (NP/Philanthropy-specific)

2.2 (J. Ewalt): Need people who do have the experience

PAGE 28

1.10 (M. Feldheim):

- → Wide open. NACC is the entity to do it. NASPAA can look at NACC / work with NACC. Should create/define NP education—values, ethics, conduct.
- → Huge need across the sector/discipline.
- → Need for higher standard

1.11 (D. Schroeter): Focus of quality. What makes high quality education in NP domain, and how to engage stakeholders/their idea of high quality. What is merit/significance of NP programs and how does it align with an accreditation process?

Q3. (R. Robichau): Where/when/how did PA get to the point of being 'worthy' of accreditation? What's the tipping point?

→ **What process did PA take to begin accreditation?**

3.1 (R. Ashcraft): Every field had to evolve this way.

3.2 (D. Springer): Social work grew out of Jane Adams (still debatable). (admin v. clinical v…)

3.3 (J. Casey) US creates associations v. accreditations. Different definitions of 'disciplines.'

Q4. (N. Dolch): What makes high quality education (regardless of accreditation)?

→ **Where should we start?**

4.1 (R. Ashcraft: Lessons to be learned from fields far ahead of us / matured.

TOPIC 4: GENERAL DISCUSSION—CONTINUED

PAGE 28—Continued

Q5. (L.Dicke): Agreement in room that quality education matters.

What does NACC have the ability to do?

5.1 (M. Hale): *A.* Anything we want.

- → International discussion tomorrow will further inform this.
- → Here's a starting point Followed by "what did we learn" and "what's next"
- → It will be NACC's decision.

Topic 6 | The NACC Accreditation Process: A Work in Progress

DAY 2 | Presenter: R. Irvin, 7/14/16

- Concern regarding fraudulent programs
  - → Aspirational programming
  - → Academic fraud

- ☼ ***NACC—not about gaining legitimacy; it's about protecting legitimacy (in light of fraudulent programs)***

- Accreditation v. certification
  - → Accreditation: carries more weight
  - → Certification: more flexible

- Don't balloon into burden

- Focus on:
  - → Truth in advertising
  - → Faculty qualification and research
  - → Curriculum that is truly nonprofit
  - → Targeted outcomes
  - → Extent of service to the profession

- Stand-alone master's degrees, graduate certificates, and concentrations
  - → Start with most common
  - → Then move on

- Evaluation
  - → Faculty
  - → Curriculum
  - ☼ Use Curricular Guidelines and Indicators of Quality

- Research capability and program
  - ☼ Less self-study
  - ☼ Frequency of course offerings (ensure actually offered)

- Ensuring outcomes (+ outcome measurement)

DAY 2 (Subject of Fraudulent NP Programs & Legitimacy) | Presenter: R. Irvin, 7/14/16—CON'T

- Service to the profession
    - → Universities state what they're doing professional-service-wise

- Accurate online presence (courses offered)

- Process: (clerical/investigate) coordinator presents findings to external review board

- Structure: no site visits
    - → Many programs online
    - → Students find programs online
    - → Money + time

- CHEA recognition~ priority but not immediately; end goal
    - → And eventually have a legally/fiscally separate accrediting entity

Questions:

☼ How much work is needed?

☼ What's the timeline?

☼ What are the fees?

DAY 2 (Subject of International Accreditation)

NOT CAPTURED DUE TO PARTICIPATION IN PANEL

Presenters & Authors: M. Tavanti, J. Casey, E. Vokes, J. Hailey (not present)

DAY 2: GROUP PROJECT
BRAINSTORM EXERCISE
TOPIC: INDICATORS OF QUALITY

General indicators (non-comprehensive):

- Ongoing assessment of outcomes
- Tenure
- Nonprofit-first
- Engaged
- Bring people together
- Impacts policy
- Experiential learning
- Extensive courses
- Relates to curricular guidelines
- Impact on students
- Careers for students
- Student-centric

Low-Quality

- Irrelevant
- Nonsystematic

SEE:

- NACC Indicators of Quality
- Carnegie Classification

MISC

- Flexibility
- What is it? (don't narrow the field)
- First step: NACC Membership?
    - → Separate entities? NASPAA requires membership first
    - → NACC Membership v. Accreditation
    - → Carnegie community engagement
- Size v. volume (not to be conflated)
    - → Faculty review like?
- Focus exclusively on curriculum?
- One size ≠ fit all
    - → Peer directed, build field

---END--- ∎