SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR
Transformation Initiative Onsite Visits
REMEMBER: TRANSFORMATION IS A PROCESS

1. The offsite report identifies specific concerns and requests for evidence that will be necessary to confirm that the EPP continues to meet the standards.
2. The addendum to the TI Self-Study Report (SSR, formerly known as the IR) provides materials and narrative to help the site visit team determine if any concerns or requests for clarification remain, related to the standards.
3. The site visit team should attempt to resolve any remaining concerns about meeting standards during the Sunday evening session. The remainder of the onsite visit should focus on the Transformation Initiative. Keep in mind that TI institutions have already been accredited and come to the TI pathway expecting to resolve AFIs and address concerns, but NOT to have a continuous improvement visit.

Conceptual framework:
1. How did the transformation initiative emerge from the conceptual framework?
   a. In what ways is it a natural extension?
   b. Are there any emerging elements from the TI that “push” the conceptual framework forward?
   c. How might you expect the transformation initiative to influence the conceptual framework in the future?

Standard 1:
1. What changes have emerged, or might you expect to emerge, in supporting candidates’ development of knowledge, skills, and dispositions due to the TI?
2. Which changes address needs identified in the field (e.g. Blue Ribbon Panel, NCATE/TEAC papers, AACTE challenges)?
3. Which changes could be replicable? In what settings? With what parameters?
4. Although the TI work is not mandated to derive from or inform any one standard in particular, what implications might the TI have for other institutions and the field in general in the area of candidate knowledge, skills and/or dispositions?

Standard 2:
1. What changes in your assessment system have occurred to document the TI?
2. How could changes in the assessment system inform the field?
3. What were, or might be, unanticipated results or impact of the TI in terms of the assessment system?
Standard 3:

1. What is the TI impact on working with school partners?
2. How are/were school partners involved with the implementation or design of the TI?
3. Which of these TI changes directly address needs identified in the field (e.g. Blue Ribbon Panel, NCATE/TEAC papers, AACTE challenges)?
4. Which of these changes could be replicated? In what settings? With what parameters?
5. Although the TI work is not mandated to derive from or inform any one standard in particular, what implications might the TI have for other educator preparation providers and the field in general in the area of field practice and clinical experiences?

Standard 4:

1. How does, or how might, the TI address issues of equity and diversity?
2. What processes or practices could be replicated? In what settings? With what parameters?
3. Although the TI work is not mandated to derive from or inform any one standard in particular, what implications might the TI have for other educator preparation providers and the field in general in the area of diversity?

Standards 5 and 6:

1. How pervasive is participation in the TI among EPP staff/faculty? What percentage of participation?
2. What presentations/publications have come, or will come, from the TI?
3. What collaborations have emerged, or do you expect to emerge, from the TI?
4. What service opportunities have emerged, or do you expect to emerge, as a result of the TI?
5. What resources, governance structures, and technology accomplishments and needs have emerged, or do you expect to emerge?

General questions:

1. Is the TI where you expected it would be at this point in time? Why or why not? What could you have done differently to maximize its success?
2. What successes have you experienced in planning or implementing the TI that have surprised you?
3. As the TI has unfolded, what challenges have you faced that you would want other EPPs to know about so that they can overcome similar challenges?
4. How has the TI process been different from the traditional accreditation process, or has it? If not, why do you think it hasn’t had a wider effect?
5. What would you want the site visit team, and the Accreditation Council to know about your TI at this point in time?
6. What more could CAEP or the site visit team have done to support the success of the transformation initiative?
Individual questions:

1. Were you involved in making the decision about having a TI, rather than Continuous Improvement (CI) accreditation visit? If not, who did make the decision? How was the decision made and vetted?

2. What were/are your expectations about TI as an accreditation pathway as opposed to CI? Were/are your expectations met/being met? If not, why not? If so, how?

3. How would you suggest your EPP continue with TI from this point forward? How will you be able to support that effort?