

## 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, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Requirements in *The Principles of Accreditation*. The component parts of the matrix are not summative nor are they necessarily of equal weight. You will need to weigh the issues when assessing the strength of the institution's compliance with the requirement.

COMPONENT	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE
<p>The narrative includes a statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The narrative is not clear, concise, nor focused.</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>The statement is focused solely on the requirement.</p>
<p>The rationale for the assertion</p>	<p>The narrative provides no explanation of reason(s) for the assertions regarding compliance with all aspects of the requirement.</p>	<p>The narrative provides a limited discussion of the reason(s) for determining compliance with all aspects of the requirement.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>The evidence supporting the assertion</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not reliable</li> <li>• It is not current</li> <li>• It is not verifiable</li> <li>• It is not coherent</li> <li>• It is not objective</li> <li>• It is not relevant</li> <li>• It is not representative</li> </ul>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not reliable</li> <li>• It is not current</li> <li>• It is not verifiable</li> <li>• It is not coherent</li> <li>• It is not objective</li> <li>• It is not relevant</li> <li>• It is not representative</li> </ul>	<p>The evidence provided sufficiently supports the institution's case because of at least three of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is reliable</li> <li>• It is current</li> <li>• It is verifiable</li> <li>• It is coherent</li> <li>• It is objective</li> <li>• It is relevant</li> <li>• It is representative</li> </ul>

COMPONENT	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE
<p>The <b>evidence-based analysis</b> of compliance</p>	<p>No analysis is offered. The analysis is not based on the evidence presented. The analysis does not pertain to the requirement.</p>	<p>The evidence-based analysis does not address all aspects of the requirement. The evidence-based analysis lacks coherency, clarity, and focus.</p>	<p>The evidence-based analysis addresses all aspects of the requirement. The evidence-based analysis is coherent, concise, and focused.</p>
<p><b>Overall judgment</b> of the case for compliance</p>	<p>The institution's case does not establish compliance because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. it does not adequately address the requirement</li> <li>b. the evidence is either missing or lacking</li> <li>c. the analysis is not grounded in data presented</li> <li>d. it is not coherent, clear, nor focused</li> </ul>		<p>The institution's case establishes compliance because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. it directly addresses all aspects of the requirement</li> <li>b. the evidence provided is sufficient</li> <li>c. the analysis provided is sufficient</li> <li>d. the case is coherent</li> </ul>

## Faculty Roster Form Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty

Name of Institution:

Name of Primary Department, Academic Program, or Discipline:

Academic Term(s) Included:

Date Form Completed:

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT Including Term, Course Number & Title, Credit Hours (D, UN, UT, G)	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK Relevant to Courses Taught, Including Institution & Major List specific graduate coursework, if needed	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS Related to Courses Taught

F, P: Full-time or Part-time; D, UN, UT, G: Developmental, Undergraduate Nontransferable, Undergraduate Transferable, Graduate

**Faculty Roster Form  
Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty**

Name of Institution: ABC College

Name of Primary Department, Academic Program, or Discipline: XXXX

Academic Term(s) Included: Fall 20XX, Spring 20XX

Date Form Completed: mm/dd/yyyy

1 NAME (F, P)	2 COURSES TAUGHT Including Term, Course Number & Title, Credit Hours (D, UN, UT, G)	3 ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK Relevant to Courses Taught, Including Institution & Major List specific graduate coursework, if needed	4 OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS Related to Courses Taught,
Joe Alvarez (F)	<p><b>Fall 2009</b> BUS 1001 Fundamentals of Accounting, 3 (UN) BUS 2001 Principles of Accounting I, 3 (UT)</p> <p><b>Spring 2010</b> BUS 1001 Fundamentals of Accounting, 3 (UN) BUS 2002 Principles of Accounting II, 3 (UT)</p>	<p>MBA (General), Good University Included the following coursework: BUS 516 Cost Accounting (3) BUS 572 Federal Income Tax (3) BUS 573 Accounting Information Systems (3) Total: 9 Graduate Semester Hrs</p> <p>BBA (Accounting), Greenhill University</p>	<p>Current CPA license, NC</p> <p>1999-2009 Accountant, Big Four Accounting Inc., Durham, NC</p> <p>3 years Auditing experience</p> <p>7 years Income Tax experience</p>
Yolanda Bing (F)	<p><b>Fall 2009</b> HIS 101, Western Civilization I, 3 (UT) HIS 110, American Society and Culture, 3 (UT) GEO 222, Latin America, 3 (UT)</p> <p><b>Spring 2010</b> HIS 102, Western Civilization II, 3 (UT) KIN 103, Karate, 1 (UT)</p>	<p>MA (History), Good University Included the following coursework: GEO 512, Hist of Cartography GEO 516, Latin American Geography GEO 640, Geo Info Sys GEO 651, Migration GEO 670, Europe GEO 680, 20th Century US Total: 18 Graduate Semester Hrs</p>	<p>Holds black belt and was first alternate to US Olympic team in Karate</p>
Steig Cederholm (P)	<p><b>Spring 2010</b> Music Composition (UT)</p>	<p>BM (Music Composition), University of Louisville</p>	<p>Published composer, including four produced symphonies and one opera, which debuted last winter at the Houston Metropolitan Opera</p> <p>Formerly the composer in residence for the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra</p>

F, P: Full-time or Part-time; D, UN, UT, G: Developmental, Undergraduate Nontransferable, Undergraduate Transferable, Graduate