

# **CAPPA ACCREDITATION BOARD**

## Sixth Annual Report

September 1, 2011 – August 31, 2012

The Accreditation Board's membership in 2011-12 was:

Ian Clark (Chair, three-year term to December 31, 2012)

Luc Bernier (two-year term December 31, 2011)

John Langford (two-year term to December 31, 2011)

Susan Phillips (three-year term to December 31, 2014)

Nancy Olewiler (two-year term to December 31, 2011)

### Meetings

The Board met once in 2011-12, via teleconference on December 5, 2011, to review accreditation reports that had been submitted for the Johnson Shoyama School of Public Policy. Minutes are attached. The Board accepted the recommendation of the accreditation review committee and grant the Johnson Shoyama School of Public Policy accreditation.

### Schools/Review Schedule

The review schedule for 2011-12 was Johnson-Shoyama School of Public Policy – Accredited (December 5, 2011). Discussions continued with other schools but no additional school was scheduled.

### Expenses and Revenues (September 1, 2011 – August 31, 2012)

Please consult the CAPPA annual financial report, since the Accreditation Board's financial transactions (e.g., receipt of accreditation fee, payment of expenses for site visits) were managed through CAPPA.

### Reflections

Over the last three years the Board has overseen only one accreditation review but it has made good progress on conceptual and procedural issues. Through exercises like the CAPPA Academic and Professional Content Review led by Ian Clark and Leslie Pal and the CAPPA-TBS professional competencies project, there is now a good idea of an appropriate core curriculum for Canadian MPP and MPA programs. The concept of the "strategic memorandum" has been refined and is now accepted as a key component of the Accreditation Review process. This Sixth Annual Report contains an annex which consists of David Good's very insightful reflections on what an Accreditation Review process is and should be.

The Board has also developed a consensus concerning the best way to expand the number of schools willing to undertake the accreditation review. It is to find out when each school is required to undergo a university- or province-required review and to do the CAPPAs review as part of this. The attractiveness of the CAPPAs review to the school is directly proportional to the credibility of the external reviewer so the Board should encourage a process of selecting highly experienced and objective committee members in consultation with the school.

*Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Board, September, 2012*

*Ian D. Clark*

#### Attachments

Minutes of the Accreditation Board Meeting of December 5, 2011

Letter to the Chair of the Accreditation Review Committee for the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy

Report of the Report CAPPAs Accreditation Review Committee for the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy

Paper by David Good, "Experience with a CAPPAs Accreditation Review"

## **CAPPA Accreditation Board**

Teleconference Meeting  
11:00 am to noon Eastern Standard Time, December 5, 2011

### **MINUTES**

#### **In attendance**

*Accreditation Board Members:* Luc Bernier, Ian Clark (Chair), John Langford, Nancy Olewiler, Susan Phillips

*Others Present:* David Good (chair of Accreditation Committee Reviewing the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy) for agenda item 2, James Clark (Secretary)

#### **Agenda**

1. Minutes of the meeting of March 2, 2010 and subsequent e-mail decisions

The minutes of the meeting of March 2, 2010 were not ready for circulation and would be circulated later for approval by mail. It could be noted that the undertaking made at the March 2, 2010 meeting to broaden the selection pool for Accreditation Review Committees led to the review of several CVs of younger academics and one person agreed to serve on a Review Committee and was appointed but later had to withdraw for health reasons. The Board approved, by e-mail on September 8, 2011, the membership of the Review Committee for the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy: Dr. David Good (chair, University of Victoria), Ms. Wynne Young, (deputy minister, Saskatchewan), and Dr. Paul Thomas (professor emeritus, University of Manitoba).

In November 2011 the CAPPA Executive Committee appointed Dr. Susan Phillips to the Accreditation Board for a renewable term from December 1, 2011. Dr. Phillips takes the place vacated by the late Dr. Peter Aucoin.

2. Accreditation Review of the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy

The Chair welcomed Susan Phillips to her first meeting of the Accreditation Board and thanked David Good for joining the meeting and asked him to present his report (attached).

David Good noted that the Johnson-Shoyama is a joint program across two universities with a unique structure with accountability to both universities' provosts. An effective MOU exists between the two schools. The Committee conducted site visits to Regina and Saskatoon as part of the accreditation assessment. The Committee recommends unanimously that the Johnson-Shoyama be granted CAPPA accreditation.

The Chair noted that the, following the practice established in the CAPPa accreditation of the Carleton program, the Committee had also prepared a strategic memorandum for the directors of the Johnson-Shoyama School. He invited David Good to share his reflections on this process with the Board.

David Good said that he believed the strategic memorandum prepared for the Executive Director and Director was an essential part of the overall accreditation review. It provided advice to the leadership of the School recognizing the importance of sustaining a strong collaborative partnership across the two universities. It focused on a number of areas which the panel believed were especially important to ensure continued success and improvement in the future. These included such areas as continued effective leadership and institutionalized support, core curriculum, managing future opportunities and challenges, and building on the important role of students in facilitating cohesion across the two campuses.

After responding to questions from the Board members, and receiving their thanks for an excellent report, David Good left the meeting.

After discussion of the Committee's report, the Board unanimously approved the recommendation of the review committee that the Johnson-Shoyama School be granted accreditation.

### 3. Process Issue: The Strategic Memorandum

It was agreed by all Board members that the strategic memorandum process seemed to be helpful to the member school being reviewed and that it would be useful to have some of the benefit of the insights in the strategic memorandum shared with the directors of other schools, perhaps by having the director of the reviewed school discuss the key points at a CAPPa meeting.

In addition, it was agreed that the Chair would ask David Good to write a short paper on his reflections of the CAPPa Accreditation Review process that could be shared with the wider CAPPa community.

### 4. Update on CAPPa-TBS Professional Competencies project

As discussed during the teleconference meeting of CAPPa directors, TBS and the Canada School of Public Served on February 24, 2011, the TBS has completed its

preliminary survey of selected departments. The results of this survey are contained in the Clark-Pal paper noted in the next agenda item.

#### 5. Update on the CAPPa Academic and Professional Content Review

Ian Clark and Leslie Pal completed their review and the results are found in the November 21, 2011 version of their paper “Academic Respectability Meets Professional Utility: Canadian MPA/MPP Programs and Professional Competencies” available in pdf form at

<http://www.publicpolicy.utoronto.ca/FacultyandContacts/IanClarkWebPageatUofT/Documents/AcademicRespectabilityMeetsProfessionalUtility21Nov2011.pdf>

#### 6. Future Accreditation Reviews

There are no programs scheduled for accreditation review. The Clark-Pal paper outlines the universe, as of 2011, of Canadian programs with a strong element of public policy and/or public administration. The following schools, in approximate order of enrolment, have received CAPPa accreditation: Carleton, Ryerson, Johnson-Shoyama, Western Ontario. The following schools, in approximate order of enrolment, have not been reviewed: ENAP, Queen’s, Ottawa, Victoria, Dalhousie, Toronto, York, Simon Fraser, Manitoba-Winnipeg, Laval, Concordia, and Moncton.

#### 7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at noon, December 5, 2011.

Ian Clark  
Chair

James Clark  
Secretary

October 5, 2011

Dr. David Good  
School of Public Administration  
University of Victoria  
PO Box 1700 STN CSC  
Victoria BC V8W 2Y2  
Office Phone: 250-721-8068

Dear Dr. Good:

ACCREDITATION COMMITTEE FOR JOHNSON-SHOYAMA

The CAPP Accreditation Board would like to thank you for agreeing to Chair the CAPP Accreditation Committee for the review of Masters of Public Administration and the Masters of Public Policy programs at the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy. The other members of the committee are Dr. Paul Thomas, Senior Scholar at the University of Manitoba ([pgthomas@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:pgthomas@cc.umanitoba.ca), 204-488-7636) and Ms. Wynne Young, Deputy Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport, Government of Saskatchewan, ([wynne.young@gov.sk.ca](mailto:wynne.young@gov.sk.ca), 306-787-5050). The contact persons at the Johnson-Shoyama School are the Executive Director, Professor Michael Atkinson ([michael.atkinson@usask.ca](mailto:michael.atkinson@usask.ca), 306-966-1984) in Saskatoon and the Associate Director, Professor Ken Rasmussen ([ken.rasmussen@uregina.ca](mailto:ken.rasmussen@uregina.ca), 306-585-5463) in Regina.

The Accreditation Board asks that your committee conduct your review in accordance with the 2007 Terms of Reference (attached) and that your review include an on-site visit to both the Saskatoon and Regina campuses. CAPP will reimburse the committee members for their travel and accommodation expenses. (Please submit claims to my attention.) The Board asks that you complete your review by November 30, 2011. In addition to the accreditation report described in the Terms of Reference (which, after acceptance by the Board, will be posted on the CAPP web site), the Committee can if it wishes prepare a “companion report to the director” with a few pages of observations and advice for the use of the director(s) of the program under review. This practice has proven useful in the past but a decision on whether to produce a companion report is up to the Committee.

Background on the CAPP accreditation process can be found on the CAPP web site at: <http://www.cappa.ca/accreditation/board.html>. I also attach the paper entitled *Managing Multiple Missions* by Leslie Pal and Susan Phillips and the September 5, 2011 draft of the paper entitled *Academic Respectability Meets Professional Utility* by Ian Clark and Leslie Pal. The directors of the Johnson-Shoyama School have agreed to take account of “generic MPA/MPP subjects” outlined in Exhibit 7 in the latter paper as part of their self

assessment. The Accreditation Committee can compare the course descriptions of the Johnson-Shoyama programs with those of other Canadian schools using publicly accessible site: <http://www.publicpolicy.utoronto.ca/ppgr/MastersPrograms/Pages/default.aspx> and they can compare the actual course content for many courses in different programs through the password-protected Public Policy and Governance Portal at <https://portal.publicpolicy.utoronto.ca>. I will send the Accreditation Committee their usernames and passwords to this site in a separate e-mail communication.

Please feel free to contact me or other members of the Accreditation Board to discuss our own experiences with the accreditation process.

Thank you again for agreeing to take on this important work.

Yours truly,



Ian D. Clark  
Chair  
CAPPa Accreditation Board

Cc. Michael Atkinson  
Ken Rasmussen  
Paul Thomas  
Wynne Young  
Members of the CAPPa Accreditation Board

Enclosures:

2007 Terms of Reference  
*Managing Multiple Missions*, Leslie Pal and Susan Phillips, 2010  
*Academic Respectability Meets Professional Utility*, Ian Clark and Leslie Pal,  
Draft of September 5, 2011

**Report**

**CAPPA Accreditation Review Panel**

**Masters of Public Administration and Masters of Public Policy  
Programs**

**Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy  
University of Regina and University of Saskatchewan**

**David A. Good (chair), Paul Thomas, Wynne Young**

**November 2011**



## **Introduction**

The Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy Accreditation Review Panel was established in October 2011. The panel members were David Good, Professor, School of Public Administration, University of Victoria who served as chair; Paul Thomas, Professor Emeritus, University of Manitoba; and Wynne Young, Deputy Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture, and Sport, Government of Saskatchewan.

Members of the review panel received a major volume of relevant materials from the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy (JSGS) in October 2011. These materials were comprehensive, of high professional quality, and were particularly useful to the review team. The documentation included: an application for accreditation; founding documents for the school; documents on strategic directions, achievements to date, student enrolment plan, student profile, and student testimonials; MPA, MPP, and certificate course information and fact sheets, course outlines, information on the internship program; governance documents including the signed MOU and agreed operating principles between University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan; documentation on the relationship between JSGS and the Province of Saskatchewan; information on the utilization of and satisfaction with executive development programs; and faculty CVs.

The Panel met on October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2011 by teleconference to review the principles of mission-based accreditation and to discuss their information needs in order to undertake the review. Information on the relationship between JSGS and the Province of Saskatchewan which was requested of the School by the review team was provided immediately. In addition, at the request of the review panel, JSGS ensured that students who had recently graduated from the program were available to the panel. The three members of the panel undertook a site visit in Regina on October 20 and in Saskatoon on October 21.

Dr. Michael Atkinson, Executive Director of JSGS and Dr. Ken Rasmussen, Director of JSGS organized two full days of meetings with a broad range of faculty, provosts, deans, students, support staff, provincial officials, and others. This included: Provosts and Vice Presidents, Academic of the two universities; the Vice President, Research of the University of Regina; the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, University of Saskatchewan; the JSGS Director of Outreach and Training; 13 faculty members; 3 graduates of the program; 4 students currently in the program; 7 support staff members including administrative managers, financial officers, and a communications specialist; the Deputy Minister to the Premier, Chair of the Public Service Commission, and Associate Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Government of Saskatchewan; the Executive Director, Western Economic Diversification; and the President of the Saskatchewan chapter of the Institute of Public Administration of Canada.

The mission of JSGD states: *We are an interdisciplinary team of scholars and practitioners who seek to improve the knowledge base from which policy makers draw,*

*the critical abilities of public policy practitioners, and the understanding of how and why policy is created.*

To provide more specificity, the aim of the School is: *To be recognized among our peers and among practitioners as Canada's best policy school: a centre for advanced education in policy and administration, a source of respected policy advice and commentary, and the home of world-class research and scholarship.*

## **RECOMMENDATION**

**The review panel unanimously recommends that Masters of Public Administration program and the Masters of Public Policy program of the Shoyama-Johnson Graduate School of Public Policy be granted accreditation for the full term of seven years.**

Since the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding by the two university Presidents in June 2007 which formally created the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, the School has made great strides toward implementing its mission and achieving its aim. JSGS has major strengths that the review panel would like to highlight.

### **The Johnston-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy**

1. The effective and enlightened leadership of the Executive Director and the Director are universally acknowledged as critical to the early success of the new school and strong leadership will be critical to its future.
2. The Memorandum of Understanding between the two universities which created the innovative institution – JSGS – and the subsequent Operating Principles Addendum have become living documents reflecting the trust and respect essential for the effective operation of a strong collaborative partnership.
3. JSGS commitment to collaboration and consultation is highly valued by faculty, students, staff, and stakeholders and underpins an open and collegial decision-making process.
4. There is a strong commitment to multi-disciplinary research and teaching, to link theory and practice, and to ensure high quality policy and administratively relevant graduate education.

### **Programs**

1. This is a strong program including an increasingly well-defined core and elective courses.
2. The outreach and professional training programs, targeted to practitioners particularly in the provincial government, are effective and well received and attended.

3. The programs are supported by a strategic and operational planning process that produces meaningful plans and targets with regular reporting across the programs, all of which are important for continuous improvement.

### **Faculty**

1. A multi-disciplinary faculty which supports strong and effective collaboration across colleagues, disciplines, scholars, and practitioners.
2. A faculty which is increasingly linked and networked with provincial government departments and agencies, supported by a strong outreach and training program which serves to reinforce the relevance of their research and can continue to strengthen their teaching in a professional school.
3. A faculty with a significant research and publication record and a demonstrated capacity to secure external research funding, thereby building bridges between training students and advancing policy relevant knowledge.
4. Faculty expertise across a relatively broad range of policy areas with generally good balance between scholarly research and practitioner based perspectives.
5. A faculty age structure which is relatively well balanced through recent and planned recruitment providing the opportunity for mentoring, injection of new ideas, and joint collaboration.

### **Staff**

1. An effective, engaged, and highly professional staff with sufficient resources to provide a comprehensive program of support to the Executive Director, Director, faculty, and students essential for efficient internal administration and high quality external communications.

### **Students**

1. An engaged and diverse community of students who have appreciated the significant opportunities to be consulted on, and participate in, the development and operation of the School.
2. An internship program, highly valued by students fortunate enough to have participated and actively sought by others, all of whom are anxious to have practical real-world learning opportunities and experience to complement their studies.
3. Students through their networks, cross campus collaboration, and their Association, have played and can continue play an important role in helping to bridge the different cultures and locations of the two campuses thereby reinforcing a single integrated School.

## **Experience with a CAPP Accreditation Review**

**David A. Good**  
**December 8, 2011**

This note provides my reflections on the CAPP Accreditation Review Panel process. It draws upon my recent experience (October-November 2011) as chair of the CAPP Accreditation Review Panel examining the Masters of Public Administration and Masters of Public Policy Programs of the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy (JSGS) at the University of Regina and University of Saskatchewan. The focus of this note is on the accreditation review process with the key points set out below:

1. When it was first proposed that I chair the review panel I had a short telephone discussion with the Chair of the CAPP Accreditation Board and the Director of JSGS. This was a useful and necessary introductory meeting to understand the importance and nature of the review, the state of development of the school, and to agree upon panel members and timing for the review. It gave me the opportunity to stress the importance of receiving good documentation on the school and its programs in advance of a site visit by the panel and to ensure that the agenda for the site visit included sufficient time at the end to debrief the Director and Executive Director of JSGS and for deliberation by the Review Panel. The Chair of the Accreditation Board subsequently established the Review Panel through letters to each member. Also included with the letters were terms of reference and principles for the review as well as a draft paper on Canadian MPA/MPP Programs and Professional Competencies entitled 'Academic Respectability Meets Professional Utility' by Ian Clark and Leslie Pal. These background materials were useful to the panel members.
2. I was most fortunate to have two excellent panel members: Paul Thomas, Professor Emeritus, University of Manitoba and Wynne Young, Deputy Minister of Tourism, Parks, Culture, and Sport, Government of Saskatchewan. Their extensive experience in very senior positions in academia and the public service, along with their significant expertise and established networks in public administration and public policy resulted in a strong and effective panel. A representative panel was also essential, which in this case included a balance in membership between scholarly research and practitioner based perspectives. I have benefited from Paul and Wynne in the preparation of this note.
3. Upon receiving the documentation from the school<sup>1</sup> and prior to the site visit I convened a teleconference call with the panel members. The Chair of

---

<sup>1</sup> In the case of JSGS the documentation was extensive and included: an application for accreditation; founding documents for the school; documents on strategic directions, achievements to date, student

Accreditation Board participated in the first part of the call and explained the nature and context of the review and answered questions. During the second part, the panel members formulated an overall approach to the review and identified additional information which was requested from JSGS and promptly provided in advance of our site visit.<sup>2</sup>

4. The Review Panel undertook a two-day site visit to JSGD – one day in Regina and the other in Saskatoon. We began with a breakfast meeting with the Executive Director and Director of the School to highlight both successes and challenges facing the school. Over the course of the next two days we met with a broad range of individuals, 37 in all, including faculty, provosts, deans, students, support staff, provincial officials, and others. The discussions were open, candid, and informative. Questions and discussion dealt with the recent formation of the school, the current situation, and the future challenges and opportunities. The focus of each discussion reflected the interests, expertise, and vantage point of the individual we met with, but overall covered a broad range of areas including, school governance, leadership, the program (especially the core), faculty, students, staff, research, teaching, outreach, internship, and mission and performance.
5. Debriefing the Executive Director and the Director on our preliminary findings near the conclusion of our second day was useful to the Panel in subsequently sharpening our findings and conclusions. We also found that it was important to reserve sufficient time (one hour) at the end of the day for the Review Panel to formulate its general conclusions, to discuss and consider various points of view and perspectives, and to map out the general contents of its written report and strategic memorandum.
6. The panel produced a report which is available on the CAPP website and a strategic memorandum prepared for the Director and Executive Director of JSGS. The report sets out the essential background and process for the review, provides a recommendation on accreditation, and highlights some of the findings of the panel in terms of school governance, the programs, faculty, staff, and students.
7. The strategic memorandum prepared for the Executive Director and Director was a critical and essential part of the overall accreditation review. It provided advice to the leadership of the School recognizing the importance of sustaining a strong collaborative partnership across the two universities. It focused on a number of areas which the panel believed were especially important to ensure continued success and improvement in the future. These included such areas as continued

---

enrolment plan, student profile, and student testimonials; MPA, MPP, and certificate course information and fact sheets, course outlines, information on the internship program; governance documents including the signed MOU and agreed operating principles between University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan; documentation on the relationship between JSGS and the Province of Saskatchewan; information on the utilization of and satisfaction with executive development programs; and faculty CVs.

<sup>2</sup> This included information on the relationship between JSGS and the Province of Saskatchewan and a request that students who had recently graduated from the program be made available to the panel.

effective leadership and institutionalized support, core curriculum, managing future opportunities and challenges, and building on the important role of students in facilitating cohesion across the two campuses.

8. When the report was considered formally by the CAPP Accreditation Board I was available for the first part of their meeting to summarize the panel's findings and recommendations, to explain our review process, and to answer questions.
9. Finally there is the critical question of the readiness of the organization to host an accreditation process and its commitment to use it, if at all possible, for learning purposes. Readiness is indicated by the extent which the organization has thought seriously about its strategic directions, has produced documents for this purpose, has linked planning to resource issues, and has rich information sources which can be related to various performance targets. In this sense accreditation should not be a symbolic ritual and institutions should not rush into the process without a commitment to provide the necessary information and to use the evidence -- both positive and negative -- for learning and improvement. By definition, not all programs can be the best and not every institution can adopt so-called 'best practices'. For some programs the measure of success might be marginal improvements over what already exists. In short, advance preparation and the development of a strong organizational commitment to the process make the accreditation process more rewarding for the panel and more valuable for the host institution.