

Report of the NASPAA Ad Hoc Committee on NASPAA’s Global Position

To Be Submitted to NASPAA Executive Council
October 2023

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND..... 1

ASSESSING NASPAA’S GLOBAL EXPANSION 1

 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS..... 5

NASPAA SUPPORT FOR PROGRAMS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES..... 6

 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS..... 7

FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF OPERATING AS A GLOBAL ASSOCIATION?..... 8

IMPACT ON THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS..... 9

 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS..... 9

PAST NASPAA PRESIDENTS:..... 1

COPRA CHAIRS:..... 1

Please complete this short feedback form by Friday, September 29, 2023.

Introduction and Background

More than a decade ago, NASPAA expanded its mission beyond the borders of the United States to champion public service education around the globe. As early as 2008, NASPAA took steps to remove barriers from international membership. NASPAA now provides programs and services, notably accreditation, to programs in Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean. For example, the 2023 simulation student competition included host sites in Columbia, Egypt, the Netherlands, and Vietnam.

Through the network's recent strategic planning process, members called for an assessment of NASPAA's global position and the services it provides to programs in countries outside the United States. NASPAA President, Trevor Brown, created an ad hoc committee on NASPAA's Global Position. The Committee consists of 7 members as follows:

Mohamad Alkadry (Chair), University of Connecticut
Jerry Zhao, ZJU
Kurt Zorn, Indiana University
Dana Michael Harsell, University of North Dakota
Jennica Larrison, University of Baltimore
Elaine Yi Lu, John Jay College, City University of New York
Palmira Rios, University of Puerto Rico (ex-NASPAA president)

The Committee was charged (See Appendix A for committee charge) with conducting an assessment of NASPAA's Global Position and offering guidance to NASPAA's Executive Council. The tasks, objectives and findings of the committee are presented in different sections of this brief report.

Assessing NASPAA's Global Expansion

Has global expansion delivered on NASPAA's goals? The initial discussion of NASPAA's goals took place in the Executive Council meeting in 2008. The decision to become a global organization with global membership and international program accreditation was mostly articulated in the 2008 Executive Council meeting. At that meeting, the Executive Council made the decision and drafted a business meeting motion to expand membership to international members who are recognized by regional accreditors or by their appropriate government body or equivalent as being approved to offer graduate academic degrees in the public affairs fields. This motion removed the most important policy barrier to international membership and subsequently to accreditation eligibility. On the accreditation side, the 2009 standards and the shift to competencies as a basis for accrediting institutions also removed some of the accreditation standards' barriers to global accreditation.

Since then, NASPAA has accepted applications for membership from schools outside the US. NASPAA currently has 28 full members in 15 countries outside the United States in Brazil (2), China (9), Colombia (3), Egypt, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, Qatar (2), Singapore, Spain, Venezuela, and Vietnam. NASPAA also has 6 schools in Hong Kong that fall under a Joint Membership with full member benefits.

The Global membership of NASPAA is roughly 11% of NASPAA's overall membership.

Brazil		Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV), Brasilia
Brazil	Accredited	Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV), Rio de Janeiro
China	Accredited	Beijing Normal University
China		Nanjing University of Finance and Economics
China	Accredited	Renmin University of China
China		Shandong University
China	Accredited	Shanghai University of Finance and Economics
China	Accredited	Sun Yat-sen University
China	Accredited	Tsinghua University
China	Accredited	University of International Business and Economics (UIBE)
China	Accredited	Zhejiang University
Colombia		National University of Colombia
Colombia	Accredited	Universidad de los Andes
Colombia		Universidad del Rosario
Egypt	Accredited	The American University in Cairo
Georgia		Ilia State University
Hong Kong		City University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong		Lingnan University
Hong Kong		The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong		The Education University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong		The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
Hong Kong		The University of Hong Kong
Hungary		Ludovika—University of Public Service
Kazakhstan	Accredited	Nazarbayev University
Korea	Accredited	KDI School of Public Policy & Management
Mexico	Accredited	Universidad Iberoamericana CIUDAD DE MEXICO
Netherlands		Maastricht University
Qatar	Accredited	Doha Institute for Graduate Studies
Qatar		Hamad Bin Khalifa University
Singapore		Nanyang Technological University
Spain		IE UNIVERSIDAD
Venezuela	Accredited	Instituto de Estudios Superiores de Administración-IESA
Viet Nam	Accredited	Fulbright University Vietnam

Sixteen of the above institutions have programs that have been accredited by NASPAA. NASPAA also has 5 global associate members.

Italy	European University Institute
Georgia	Georgian Institute of Public Affairs
Qatar	Institute of Public Administration - Civil Service & Gov't Development Bu
Saudi Arabia	Alfozan Academy
Switzerland	Swiss Graduate School of Public Administration (IDHEAP)

Annual NASPAA conference attendance from international institutions has also been less than 10% of overall attendance except for the year before the covid pandemic where international attendance peaked at 71 attendees with a presence of some panels in Mandarin and Spanish.

International Conference Attendance 2017-2022

Year	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Number	49	50	76	67	42	29
Percentage of all attendees	8%	7%	11%	9%	6%	5%

Since 2007, NASPAA also held several regional meetings internationally. Those include:

- Dubai, United Arab Emirates December 7-9, 2007:** “International Quality Conference in Public Affairs Education Hosted by NASPAA and Sharjah University
- Beijing, China–April 2015:** NASPAA held a two-day conference with China MPA Steering Committee
- Shanghai, China– September 2017:** Standard Colloquia Discussion at Conference on Globalization hosted by Shanghai University of Finance and Economics
- Mexico City–January 24-25, 2017:** Quality of Education for the Public Service in Mexico, Hosted by NASPAA & National Institute of Public Administration (INAP)
- Doha, Qatar–Nov 13-14, 2017:** Toward A Quality Public Service Education Conference Hosted by NASPAA & Doha Institute for Graduate Studies
- Cairo, Egypt–February 24-25, 2018:** Faculty Seminar Hosted by NASPAA & American University of Cairo
- Beijing, China–April 6-7, 2018:** [Conference on Global Quality and Innovative Pedagogy](#), Hosted by NASPAA & Renmin University
- Bucharest, Romania–June 2018:** Standards Colloquia Discussion at Transatlantic Dialogue
- Concepcion, Chile–April 23, 2019:** [State of Public Service Education Across the Americas](#), NASPAA Workshop at INPAE Conference
- Guadalajara, Mexico–May 2018:** Standards Colloquia Discussion at INPAE Annual Conference
- New Delhi, India–Feb 25-26th 2019:** [2019 South Asia Public Affairs Conference](#), Governance in an Era of Inequality: Training the Next Generation of Policy Practitioners in South Asia Hosted by NASPAA & O.P. Jindal Global University
- Virtual, Nov 12-14th 2021:** [2021 Virtual NASPAA South Asia Conference](#), Hosted by NASPAA; the South Asian Institute of North South University, Bangladesh; and the JSW School of Public Policy at the Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, India.

After fifteen years of making a decision to become a global organization, NASPAA appears to have enrolled some international universities, accredited less programs, and its annual conference has attracted some international attendees.

NASPAA also held simulation competitions at several international sites.

Global Warming 2016: United Nations University - MERIT and Maastricht University (Maastricht, Netherlands)

Food Security 2017: Universidad de los Andes (Bogotá, Columbia); United Nations University - MERIT and Maastricht University (Maastricht, Netherlands); and Tsinghua University (Beijing, China)

Global Pandemic 2018: Universidad de los Andes and Universidad del Rosario (Bogotá, Columbia); The American University in Cairo (Cairo, Egypt); Central European University (Budapest, Hungary); KDI School of Public Policy and Management (Sejong-si, Republic of Korea); University of International Business and Economics (Beijing, China)

Global Migration 2019: Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas División de Administración (Mexico City, Mexico); KDI School of Public Policy and Management (Sejong-si, Republic of Korea); North South University (Dhaka, Bangladesh); The American University in Cairo (Cairo, Egypt); United Nations University - MERIT and Maastricht University (Maastricht, Netherlands) in partnership with Central European University (Budapest, Hungary)

Sustainable Cities 2020: Central European University (Budapest, Hungary) in partnership with United Nations University - MERIT and Maastricht University (Maastricht, Netherlands); Institute of Public Policy, National Law School of India University and Fields of View (Bangalore, India); KDI School of Public Policy and Management (site cancelled due to Covid)

Wildfire Mitigation 2023: United Nations University - MERIT and Maastricht University (Maastricht, Netherlands); The American University in Cairo (Cairo, Egypt); Fulbright University Vietnam (Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam); Universidad del Rosario (Bogotá, Colombia)

NASPAA also engaged several international associations in memoranda of understanding (MOU) documents. These include:

European Association for Public Administration Accreditation (EAPPA) MOU—Signed December 15, 2011, the MOU with EAPPA was a cooperative agreement between the organizations to reduce procedural redundancies and the overall burden to programs that wish to seek accreditation from both NASPAA and EAPPA. The terms of the MOU were effective for five years (expiring on December 15, 2016). NASPAA does not have a current MOU with EAPAA

Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe (NISPAcee) MOU—Signed May 23, 2012, the MOU with NISPAcee was a cooperative agreement between the organizations to promote communication amongst association leaders about shared concerns and interests and to identify and pursue opportunities for collaboration to address mutual interests. The MOU focused on engagement with each other's conferences, promoting each other's activities, and seeking and securing external funding where mutual interests aligned. The terms of the MOU were effective for five years (expiring on May 23, 2017). NASPAA does not have a current MOU with NISPAcee.

La Red Inter-Americana de Educación en Administración Pública (INPAE) MOU—Signed May 19, 2018, the MOU with INPAE was a cooperative agreement between the organizations to promote communication amongst association leaders about shared concerns and interests and to identify and pursue opportunities for collaboration to address mutual interests. The collaboration would also simultaneously support

NASPAA's efforts to enhance its capacity to evaluate programs in Latin America and the interests of INPAE members who want to pursue NASPAA accreditation. This MOU was an updated commitment to collaboration following an MOU signed between the organizations in 2012. The terms of the MOU were effective for five years (expiring on May 19, 2023). NASPAA does not have a current MOU with INPAE.

Canadian Association of Programs in Public Administration (CAPPA) MOU—Signed October 18, 2018, the MOU with CAPPA is a cooperative agreement between the organizations to strengthen and sustain the relationship between the two associations and make progress towards achieving some of our shared goals. The MOU discusses how NASPAA and CAPAA will cooperate, collaborate, and communicate about accreditation, research, student engagement, and teaching and learning and will promote each other's activities. This MOU was an updated commitment to collaboration following an MOU signed between the organizations in 2014. The terms of the MOU are effective for five years (expiring on October 18, 2023).

African Association for Public Administration and Management (AAPAM) MOU—Signed October 16, 2019, the MOU with AAPAM is a cooperative agreement between the organizations to build a relationship between the two associations and make progress towards achieving some of our shared goals. The MOU discusses how NASPAA and CAPAA will cooperate, collaborate, and communicate about promoting best practices, research, study, and capacity building in public administration and management and will promote each other's activities. The terms of the MOU are effective for four years (expiring on October 16, 2023).

NASPAA had an International Committee until 2018 when it was determined that as a global organization global aspects should be integrated into what the organization does and there should not be a separate committee for international issues. The International Committee was disbanded but it is not clear that the global aspects were integrated into other committees.

Has NASPAA become a global organization or a US organization with international membership? This question was asked indirectly during the three listening sessions that were held in May 2023. The answers the Committee heard often pointed to a US organization that welcomed international members and often struggled with becoming a full-fledged global organization.

Committee Recommendations

NASPAA's original goals of becoming a global organization were not articulated well beyond the interest in attracting global members. This Committee recommends that NASPAA articulates these goals with measurable objectives and a timeline for achieving these goals. The Committee further recommends a separation between quality public affairs programs and the political systems they operate under.

NASPAA's global expansion thus-far seems to have attracted some member schools from BRIC countries and the global south. For the most part, European countries seemed less interested in NASPAA accreditation or membership. It is recommended that NASPAA's global expansion be tied to its other strategic goals – bringing a global perspective to other NASPAA members and providing capacity-building opportunities to global institutions looking to enhance their capacity in preparing future public service professionals.

The Committee further recommends that a multi-pronged strategy be employed to enhance NASPAA's global position:

1. Promote a NASPAA membership culture of humility via a collective effort and a commitment to fostering a learning environment, recognizing strengths of others, and emphasizing collective success in planning and implementing NASPAA-related activities.

2. Create a list of target institutions through in-house research and the different international associations who have active MoUs with NASPAA
3. Seek USAID, Department of State, UNDP or other types of funding to support international institutional membership in NASPAA, travel to NASPAA conferences and participation in the accreditation process
4. Create a NASPAA sister-institution program that connects global institutions with current NASPAA members (US and non-US based institutions can be sponsors)
5. Engage in a membership discussion about the value that non-US members add to all NASPAA member institutions.
6. Use of teaching and learning as a tool to enhance global reach – NASPAA's added value needs to be articulated independent of the value of accreditation.
7. Hire dedicated staff to focus on global expansion and with clear deliverables of seeking funding for, and achieving, global expansion.

NASPAA Support for Programs Outside the United States

Needed support for programs outside the US was one of the key discussion items in the three listening sessions that the Committee held in May 2023 – two with international programs and one with a domestic program. Here are some of the findings from these listening sessions specifically on the question on how NASPAA can support international programs who are existing or prospective members of NASPAA.

Participants in one of the international listening sessions indicated that conversations at NASPAA conferences and committees are too American. The concerns that rise to the top of committee agendas tend to be American concerns and non-US programs feel left out in the conversation. The Committee notes here that with 85-90% U.S. members, the focus on US issues seems reasonable.

More NASPAA promotion and recruitment is needed in other countries. There should be a better inventory of programs that exist outside the US and an assessment of their capacity to join NASPAA with financial and capacity considerations. NASPAA may want to then consider targeting particular regions or a number of countries in each region.

International programs tend to be in well-funded and elite institutions, which leaves NASPAA out of reach for under-funded and public institutions in these countries. It would be good for NASPAA to conduct a comprehensive country-by-country inventory of international programs in PA education with the following objectives: i) have hard data on program characteristics, ii) understand program's incentives and interest to join NASPAA and interest on a global accreditation process; and iii) identify barriers that programs have to join NASPAA and to go through accreditation. This inventory should help NASPAA identify prospective members.

Another issue raised by some participants in the listening sessions is the inadequate understanding of the value of global engagement by some NASPAA member schools and their faculty. Helping American schools understand the value of international engagement will help make international programs feel welcome at NASPAA and will make the relationships among US-based and non-US-based schools more beneficial to both parties. Today, the issues we address domestically in the US are often global in nature. Continuing to highlight these connections could assist with global engagement in all directions.

Separation and integration at the annual conference was another issue raised by participants in the focus groups. Domestic and international separation in panels seemed to encourage two distinct conference experiences for domestic and international participants. Program committees should seek integration of a

global perspective in most panels where the topic is not exclusively US-based. This is not an invitation to eliminate the focus on the US issues because most of the members and conference attendees today remain US-based.

In international panels, there seems to be displeasure that NASPAA accredits programs in countries that have less than democratic systems. That creates an awkward situation where international members feel less welcome. While this committee supports self-determination and democratic values, it is worthwhile noting that improving the quality of graduate education and graduate programs should benefit all students regardless of the political system in which they exist.

Another issue that came up in the listening sessions is that NASPAA is more outspoken on national issues but not on international issues. It is not clear to international members why that is the case.

Committee Recommendations

International programs have varying degrees of resources and their access to funds to engage with membership applications, accreditation, conference attendance or sending students to simulations. If one takes a quick look at NASPAA's current non-US-based roster of members, it become quickly apparent that many of the international programs engaging with NASPAA are institutions with better access to resources (the term elite schools was used in listening sessions). For instance, the American University of Cairo has been a regular participant in NASPAA for at least 15 years, while Cairo University with thousands of public affairs students has never participated in NASPAA. Cairo University is a quality institution that lacks the budget to pursue this relationship. NASPAA's global engagement should be consistent with its equity mission and should create opportunities for global programs based on impact and not just ability to participate.

1. Having some components of the national conference delivered as hybrid, or holding some events that are accessible through virtual media would provide non-US based programs and some US programs with the opportunity to attend the conference without having to incur costs that they cannot afford.
2. Engage the membership in an open discussion about the value of global engagement and the added value of that engagement to NASPAA members and to global institutions' students and stakeholders.
3. NASPAA should improve access to all international institutions, perhaps through funding from international organizations or finding other sources of funding. This could include the creation of a global fund that could assist in defraying COPRA costs to global institutions, a travel fund, and or assist with costs for global meetings.
4. NASPAA should identify best practices by other membership associations or accrediting bodies when it comes to international engagement.
5. NASPAA should create regional peer groups and identify strategies for engagement for these at conferences and in terms of outreach.
6. Make a deliberate effort to include a global perspective in a substantial number of NASPAA panels – the goal is have 25% of the panels include a global perspective.

7. Make an effort to include more submissions to NASPAA awards from global institution.
8. Committees and a deliberate global perspective
9. Create a global outreach committee with a charge to seek and encourage new members globally

Financial Impacts of Operating as a Global Association?

What would be the programmatic and financial consequences of not pursuing additional members outside the United States?

There is no question that global accreditation and membership provide unique growth opportunities for NASPAA. From 2013 to 2023, NASPAA has had 58 programs join NASPAA Accreditation. Of those, 23 were programs based outside the United States; 40% of growth in accreditation over the past 10 years has come from non-US programs. A breakdown per year can be found [here](#).

Since 2007 there have been 149 schools/organizations who have applied for NASPAA membership (Full & Associate). Of those 149 schools/organizations 92 have been located within the United States and 57 have been located outside of the United States (38%). Since 2010 80 schools/ organizations have not renewed their NASPAA membership (this is not of the 149 schools indicated above but of all NASPAA members). Of the 80 schools/organizations 60 have been located within the United States (53 Full members, 7 Associate Members) and 20 have been located outside of the United States (12 Full members, 8 Associate Members). More info can be found [here](#).

Of the current 310 Full NASPAA Members, 34 of them are located outside of the United States (11%), of the current 21 Associate Members 7 of them are located outside of the United States (33%).

There has been substantial international interest in NASPAA membership but there is also high turnover as schools who do not seek NASPAA accreditation may have a harder time seeing the value of membership.

Therefore, investment in global growth is likely to have financial and status returns for NASPAA. If NASPAA's growth cannot be supported by grants, there might be a market-based case for investing in staffing.



Impact on the accreditation process

What are the challenges for programs outside the US in participating in the accreditation process and meeting the standards?

This was also the subject of discussions at the listening sessions. The following summarizes the feedback received from these sessions.

- Have differentiated fees for international programs, particularly those based in countries with weak currencies (against the dollar).
- The deterioration of public sector in some countries like Venezuela has had a substantial impact on public service programs. Most countries in the global south have issues that expand beyond their capacity to prepare students for public service. Public service systems in many of these countries tend to be aging and struggle with entry, retention, compensation and development within their own public sectors.
- It might be helpful to have an international Accreditation Institute, or at least to create a breakout session for international programs for some of the content.
- It might be helpful for NASPAA to provide support for first time conference presence and membership – perhaps through a conference sponsorship program where some U.S. or international programs would sponsor a colleague from another country.
- Communication about accreditation categories and standards tend to be geared more toward an American audience which makes it harder for International programs to feel included
- Continuous review of basis of judgment and clarifying examples to include global examples
- Diversity standards appear differently in different concepts
- More examples of diversity and understanding of diversity context
- Transfer of credits is an issue. A better process for credit equivalency is needed

Committee Recommendations

1. COPRA composition: At least two COPRA members should come from an international program. This will guarantee that we have an international voice in COPRA.
2. International Accreditation Academy could be helpful in supporting global institutions. A working committee could be considered to assist in implementation and institutionalization.
3. COPRA should develop a toolkit to ease the process of seeking accreditation.
4. Develop relationships with the national accreditors in different global contexts
5. Add some training resources and videos on how some standards and categories are evaluated against program mission in different international contexts, and for that matter, in different states.

Please complete this short feedback form by Friday, September 29, 2023.

Past NASPAA Presidents:

2021-2022	Susan D. Gooden	Virginia Commonwealth University
2020-2021	Laura Bloomberg	University of Minnesota
2019-2020	Robert C. Orr	University of Maryland, College Park
2018 - 2019	Palmira Rios-Gonzalez	University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus
2017 - 2018	Jack Meek	University of La Verne
2016 - 2017	David Birdsell	Baruch College, CUNY
2015 - 2016	Michelle Piskulich	Oakland University
2014 - 2015	J. Edward Kellough	The University of Georgia
2013 - 2014	Ethel Hill Williams	University of Nebraska Omaha
2012 - 2013	Jack Knott	University of Southern California
2011 - 2012	Nadia Rubaii	Binghamton University
2010 - 2011	Frances Berry	Florida State University
2009 - 2010	Jeffrey Raffel	University of Delaware
2008 - 2009	Marvin Mandell	University of Maryland, Baltimore County
2007 - 2008	Kathleen Beatty	University of Colorado Denver

COPRA Chairs:

Domonic A. Bearfield	9/1/21	8/31/22
Shawn Flanigan	9/1/20	8/31/21
Maja H. Holmes	9/1/19	8/31/20
Jeff Osgood	9/1/16	8/31/19
Jeff Osgood	9/1/17	8/31/18
Laura Bloomberg	9/1/16	8/31/17
Jo Ann Ewalt	9/1/15	8/31/16
Chandler Stolp	10/14/12	8/31/15
RaJade M. Berry-James	9/1/11	8/31/14
Rex L. Facer	9/1/09	8/31/12
Michelle Piskulich	9/1/08	8/31/11
Michelle Piskulich	9/1/07	8/31/10
Nadia Rubaii	9/1/06	8/31/09