ANALYZING A CASE FOR COMPLIANCE

NOTE: The information presented below is intended to assist the Committee in focusing and developing its analysis of the institution's case for its compliance with the Core Requirements and Standards in *The Principles of Accreditation*. The component parts of the matrix are not summative, nor are they necessarily of equal weight. Evaluators will need to weigh the issues when assessing the strength of the institution's compliance with the requirement.

COMPONENT	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE
The narrative includes a statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement	Either the narrative does not include a statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement, or it is not applicable to the specific accreditation requirement.	The narrative includes a general statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement but it does not address each of the components of the requirement. The narrative is neither clear, concise, nor focused.	The narrative includes a statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement that addresses each of the components of the requirement (as necessary). The statement is focused solely on the requirement.
The **rationale** for the assertion	The narrative provides no explanation of reason(s) for the assertions regarding compliance with all aspects of the requirement.	The narrative provides a limited discussion of the reason(s) for determining compliance with all aspects of the requirement.	The narrative provides a clear and concise statement of the reason(s) for the assertion regarding the institution's perception of compliance with the requirement.
The **evidence** supporting the assertion	Either no evidence is presented to support the institution's case or the evidence provided is unacceptable because of two or more of the following characteristics: • It is not reliable • It is not current • It is not verifiable • It is not coherent • It is not objective • It is not relevant • It is not representative	Either the evidence provided is uneven in its support of the institution's case or it is deficient because of one of the following characteristics: • It is not reliable • It is not current • It is not verifiable • It is not coherent • It is not objective • It is not relevant • It is not representative	The evidence provided sufficiently supports the institution's case because of at least three of the following characteristics: • It is reliable • It is current • It is verifiable • It is coherent • It is objective • It is relevant • It is representative

COMPONENT	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE
The **evidence-based analysis** of compliance	No analysis is offered. The analysis is not based on the evidence presented. The analysis does not pertain to the requirement.	The evidence-based analysis does not address all aspects of the requirement. The evidence-based analysis lacks coherency, clarity, and focus.	The evidence-based analysis addresses all aspects of the requirement. The evidence-based analysis is coherent, concise, and focused.
Overall judgment of the case for compliance	The institution's case does not establish compliance because: a. it does not adequately address the requirement b. the evidence is either missing or lacking c. the analysis is not grounded in data presented d. it is not coherent, clear, nor focused		The institution's case establishes compliance because: a. it directly addresses all aspects of the requirement b. the evidence provided is sufficient c. the analysis provided is sufficient d. the case is coherent