JOTE Journal of Occupational Therapy Education

Volume 7 | Issue 2 Article 16

2023

Assessment of an Online Learning Module to Promote Fieldwork Educator Preparedness: A Pilot Study

Breanna J. Chycinski
Grand Valley State University

Casey E. Humphrey
Eastern Kentucky University

Camille Skubik-Peplaski
Eastern Kentucky University

Recommended Citation

Chycinski, B. J., Humphrey, C. E., & Skubik-Peplaski, C. (2023). Assessment of an Online Learning Module to Promote Fieldwork Educator Preparedness: A Pilot Study. *Journal of Occupational Therapy Education, 7* (2). https://doi.org/10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Assessment of an Online Learning Module to Promote Fieldwork Educator Preparedness: A Pilot Study

Abstract

Fieldwork education is a vital component of occupational therapy education. Academic fieldwork coordinators face a shortage of qualified occupational therapists who are prepared to be fieldwork educators. This pilot study aimed to evaluate the effects of an online learning module developed to prepare occupational therapists to become fieldwork educators. A pre- and post-survey were used to measure changes in perceived preparedness following completion of an online learning module. A 39-item electronic survey measured perceived preparedness of the following fieldwork educator competencies: education, supervision, evaluation, and administration. Sixteen participants completed all three components of the study: pre-survey, the learning module, and post-survey. Significant findings indicate completion of the online learning module led to participants feeling more prepared to: (a) implement a professional development plan; (b) use a variety of instructional strategies; (c) use current supervision models and theories; (d) initiate interaction to resolve conflict; (e) communicate and collaborate with academic programs to integrate the academic curriculum; (f) complete and provide the academic program with required paperwork; (g) use fieldwork evaluation tools to accurately measure student performance and provide feedback; (h) design and implement a fieldwork program in collaboration with the academic fieldwork coordinator in accordance with Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) Standards; (i) document an organized, systematic, fieldwork program; (j) identify the legal and health care policies that directly influence fieldwork; and (k) complete an orientation for the student. Implementing an online fieldwork educator learning module had a positive impact on occupational therapists preparing for the role of Level II fieldwork educator.

Keywords

Fieldwork education, fieldwork educator preparedness, Level II fieldwork students, fieldwork educator characteristics, adult learning

JOTE
Journal of Occupational Therapy Education

Volume 7, Issue 2

Assessment of an Online Learning Module to Promote Fieldwork Educator Preparedness: A Pilot Study

Breanna Chycinski, OTD, OTRL[1]

Casey Humphrey, OTD, MHA, OTR/L[2]

Camille Skubik-Peplaski, PhD, OTR/L, FAOTA[2]

Grand Valley State University[1]

Eastern Kentucky University[2]

United States

ABSTRACT

Fieldwork education is a vital component of occupational therapy education. Academic fieldwork coordinators face a shortage of qualified occupational therapists who are prepared to be fieldwork educators. This pilot study aimed to evaluate the effects of an online learning module developed to prepare occupational therapists to become fieldwork educators. A pre- and post-survey were used to measure changes in perceived preparedness following completion of an online learning module. A 39-item electronic survey measured perceived preparedness of the following fieldwork educator competencies: education, supervision, evaluation, and administration. Sixteen participants completed all three components of the study: pre-survey, the learning module, and post-survey. Significant findings indicate completion of the online learning module led to participants feeling more prepared to: (a) implement a professional development plan; (b) use a variety of instructional strategies; (c) use current supervision models and theories; (d) initiate interaction to resolve conflict; (e) communicate and collaborate with academic programs to integrate the academic curriculum; (f) complete and provide the academic program with required paperwork; (g) use fieldwork evaluation tools to accurately measure student performance and provide feedback; (h) design and implement a fieldwork program in collaboration with the academic fieldwork coordinator in accordance with Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) Standards; (i) document an organized, systematic, fieldwork program; (j) identify the legal and health care policies that directly influence fieldwork; and (k) complete an orientation for the student. Implementing an online fieldwork educator learning module had a positive impact on occupational therapists preparing for the role of Level II fieldwork educator.

Introduction

According to the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA), “fieldwork education is the essential bridge between academic education and authentic occupational therapy practice” (AOTA, 2009b, p. 822). The need for quality fieldwork sites and qualified fieldwork educators continues to increase as the number of students enrolled in occupational therapy programs across the world increases. There are over 900 occupational therapy programs approved by the World Federation of Occupational Therapists (WFOT), all of which seek high-quality fieldwork opportunities for their enrolled students (WFOT, 2022). As a result, academic fieldwork coordinators face a shortage of clinicians who are both qualified and prepared to become fieldwork educators (Evenson et al., 2015; Hunt & Kennedy-Jones, 2010; Kirke et al., 2007).

Fieldwork educators are individuals who supervise occupational therapy students. According to the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE, 2018), fieldwork educators for Level II occupational therapy students must be currently licensed or otherwise regulated and have a minimum of one-year, full-time practice experience following initial certification. Dickerson (2006) outlined role competencies used by academic institutions in the identification of competent fieldwork educators, which include knowledge, critical reasoning, interpersonal skills, performance skills, and ethical reasoning. Additionally, the Commission on Education (COE, n.d.) recommended that occupational therapists should complete continuing education courses specifically related to their role as fieldwork educators in the areas of adult education models and theories, teaching styles, administration and management of a clinical fieldwork program, instructional design, supervision strategies, and evaluation of student performance. Additional studies (Hunt & Kennedy-Jones, 2010; Kirke et al., 2007) stated a good fieldwork educator exhibits many of the characteristics listed above and adds that they should be well prepared in advance of accepting a student, provide students with clear expectations, promote the profession in a positive manner, allow students to learn by making mistakes within a safe environment, and communicate well. While literature regarding qualities of an effective fieldwork educator exists (Dickerson, 2006; Dunn et al., 2020; Hanson, 2011; Hunt & Kennedy-Jones, 2010; Kirke et al., 2007; Roberts et al., 2014; Ryan et al., 2018; Stutz-Tanenbaum & Hooper, 2009), little is understood about how to facilitate the transition from a novice fieldwork educator to a competent fieldwork educator. To ensure continuation of high-quality fieldwork education in the field of occupational therapy, identification of best practices for establishing fieldwork educator preparedness is critical.

Developing skills as a competent occupational therapy practitioner does not necessarily lead to skill competency and preparedness as a fieldwork educator (Hunt & Kennedy-Jones, 2010). Occupational therapy practitioners should engage in critical reflection of current clinical skills and knowledge. Additionally, they should identify areas of need as a commitment to lifelong learning and responsibility to the profession (Cranwell et al., 2020). The same expectation exists for an occupational therapist’s role as a fieldwork educator. The American Occupational Therapy Association (2009a) published the Self-Assessment Tool for Fieldwork Educator Competency (SAFECOM) as a way for fieldwork educators to reflect on their own level of competency in the following areas:

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

professional practice, education, supervision, evaluation (of student performance), and administration. The Commission on Education (n.d.) suggested methods for attaining fieldwork educator competency, including completion of the AOTA Fieldwork Educator Certificate Program (FWECP), reflection using the SAFECOM, attending continuing education events on the topic, mentorship by experienced fieldwork educators, and completion of online modules. Books on the topic of fieldwork education are also available for occupational therapy clinicians, which contain valuable resources for developing fieldwork educator role competency (Costa, 2015; DeLuliis & Hanson, 2023; Hanson & DeLuliis, 2023). While these resources are valuable, barriers prevent them from being accessible to all occupational therapy practitioners. Evenson et al. (2015) reported that 61% of their study participants were not aware of the AOTA FWECP. Additionally, a study completed by Karp et al. (2022) attempted to identify how occupational therapy practitioners were prepared to assume the role of fieldwork educator during their professional education and post professionally, as well as examined the perceived effectiveness of available tools to support their role as a fieldwork educator and the barriers that exist when utilizing the available tools. Overall, the majority of the participants included in the study by Karp et al. (2022) did not use tools and supports that were available to them. The most common barrier identified by participants included a lack of awareness of the tools or lack of knowledge regarding how to access the tools. Cost was listed as the most frequently cited barrier to the AOTA FWECP (Karp et al., 2022).

Supports and resources that occupational therapists value and need to support their role as a fieldwork educator have been identified in the research. Karp et al. (2022) noted several supports that occupational therapists found essential to either assume or improve in their role as a fieldwork educator. Supports and resources included education provided by the academic program, free fieldwork educator training, along with support from the facility with regards to educating future practitioners. Hanson (2011) used focus groups to inquire about factors therapists contemplated before accepting fieldwork students. Data suggests that support from the academic program is highly valued, especially with regards to ongoing communication throughout the fieldwork experience, sharing of the student's learning profile, explaining fieldwork expectations, and reviewing the academic curriculum. Additionally, fieldwork educators expressed a desire to receive resources about "providing appropriate feedback, dealing with conflict, and managing struggling students…training updates on the evaluation form and resources for tailoring the learning experience to fit each student" (Hanson, 2011, p. 173). Evenson et al. (2015) conducted a study that resulted in similar findings. Ongoing availability of the academic fieldwork coordinator, free courses related to fieldwork education, and face-to-face meetings between the academic fieldwork coordinator, student, and fieldwork educator were listed within the top five most valued supports provided by academic programs. Hunt and Kennedy-Jones (2010) studied the needs of novice clinicians, stating that opportunities exist for academic programs to provide learning opportunities to new therapists specific to fieldwork education. Additionally, Varland et al. (2017) reported the need for more resources related to supervision strategies, learning styles, fieldwork expectations, addressing difficult student issues and how to facilitate learning.

Academic programs work diligently to ensure establishment of high-quality fieldwork sites; however, practitioners often feel that they are not adequately prepared to serve as fieldwork educators (Chapman, 2016). Even though they exhibit supervisory skills, "practitioners may not be prepared to apply instructional design principles to create the most effective learning experiences if they have not been educated in how to design learning in a systematic way" (Chapman, 2016, p. 32). The AOTA (2018) provided a list of criteria that constitutes an exemplar fieldwork educator, however little research exists exploring the resources needed for fieldwork educators to become prepared for this role (Roberts et al., 2014). To fill this gap, this researcher created an online learning module, titled *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module,* which was developed to prepare occupational therapists to become fieldwork educators. The purpose of this study was to pilot the online learning module and evaluate how it impacted the perceived preparedness of occupational therapists to take on the role of a fieldwork educator. The following research question was used to guide the study: What is the change in perceived level of preparedness of occupational therapy practitioners related to their role as a fieldwork educator for Level II occupational therapy students, following completion of the online learning module?

Methods

Design

This descriptive, one group, pretest-posttest research study aimed to evaluate the effects of an online learning module developed to prepare occupational therapists to become fieldwork educators. A pre-survey and post-survey were used to measure changes in fieldwork educator perceived preparedness after completion of *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module*. Participants were recruited using convenience and snowball sampling. As an academic fieldwork coordinator for an occupational therapy program, the researcher had access to a database containing contact information for approximately 385 current fieldwork educators located across the country. The researcher also had access to contact information of approximately 480 graduates of the occupational therapy program who could be eligible participants in this study. Additionally, with the research mentor being the academic fieldwork coordinator from another occupational therapy program, participants were recruited by accessing contacts via their alumni fieldwork educator database, consisting of 76 occupational therapists. Social media sites were also used as a recruitment method. Participants were eligible for this study if they met the following inclusion criteria: (1) licensed occupational therapist, (2) a minimum of one-year full-time clinical experience as an occupational therapist, and (3) currently working full-time as an occupational therapist. The study contained three parts: pre-survey, completion of the online learning module, and post-survey. This study was approved the by the Institutional Review Board at Grand Valley State University.

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Procedures

Online Learning Module

The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module was developed specifically for this pilot study with the focus on increasing perceived fieldwork educator preparedness. It included content related to four of the competency areas within the SAFECOM (AOTA, 2009a): education, supervision, evaluation, and administration. The online learning module was divided into five sections with 14 specific topics: (1) the purpose of fieldwork, (2) goals of Level II Fieldwork, (3) fieldwork guidelines, (4) explanation of roles, (5) starting a new fieldwork program and required documents, (6) fieldwork manual, (7) learning theories and learning styles, (8) identifying and meeting the needs of students, (9) supervision requirements, (10) supervision styles and models, (11) challenging fieldwork situations, (12) feedback, (13) formal evaluation, and (14) evaluation of the fieldwork experience (ACOTE, 2018; AOTA, 2020a; AOTA, 2020b; AOTA, 2020c; AOTA, 2013; AOTA, 2010; Armstrong, 2010; Cantillon & Sargeant, 2008; Costa, 2015; Gill, 2020; Johnson et al., 2015).

When developing educational or training programs for adult learners, it is important to understand how integrating adult learning theories and principles can enhance the overall effectiveness and desired outcomes. Malcom Knowles' theory of andragogy identified six key principles that instructors of adult learners should follow. These principles focus on assumptions that adults need to know why they need to learn something, are self-directed, have experience to draw new learning upon, are internally motivated, are looking for practical learning experiences, and adult learning should focus on solving problems (Collins, 2004; Culatta, 2023; Kadakia & Owens, 2020; Knowles et al., 2015; Learning Theories, 2017). Adult learning theories and guiding principles were thoughtfully considered during the development of *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module*. Understanding that adult learners are self-directed, the online module was designed so that participants could move through the content at their own pace without the guidance from an outside source (Knowles et al., 2015; Learning Theories, 2017). The beliefs that adult learners are both internally motivated and are looking for practical learning experiences were the main guiding principles behind the online module content (Learning Theories, 2017). Internal motivation to complete the online module could have come from a variety of sources, such as the desire to take fieldwork students but not feeling prepared or having experience as a fieldwork educator with the realization that more knowledge is needed to become more effective. Keeping this in mind, it was important to include content that would be relevant for both novice fieldwork educators (such as the goal and purpose of fieldwork, fieldwork guidelines, and how to create a successful fieldwork program) and for those who have had some experience to build upon (i.e., identifying and meeting the needs of students; challenging fieldwork situations) (Knowles et al., 2015). This researcher strived to include content that was specifically deemed as practical to the role of a fieldwork educator and could immediately be implemented in practice. Examples include suggested materials for a fieldwork manual, review of supervision styles and how to

match with student needs, along with how to provide students with constructive feedback about their performance. In addition to the module content, resources and handouts were available to download and use (Knowles et al., 2015; Learning Theories, 2017). Appendix A includes a full list of the module topics.

Participants accessed *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module* through Articulate Rise 360, an online course development platform. Recruitment materials included a link to the Articulate Rise 360 platform. To begin, participants were required to take the pre-survey. Question 1 of the pre-survey required participants to consent to the study, and were informed that by clicking "Next", they were agreeing to be a willing participant. By doing so, they were given access to the remaining pre-survey questions. Following submission of the pre-survey, participants were then able to access *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module.* Once the module was completed, participants were then given access to the post-survey.

The module was designed so that participants were required to complete the items sequentially, from the pre-survey, through the module content, then to the post-survey. Participants had the ability to start and stop to complete the module at their own pace. Knowledge checks were not included throughout the module since the focus of the study was on measuring perceived preparedness and not on obtainment of new knowledge. It was anticipated that the total completion time for the learning module would be 2.0 hours. An outline of the module topics, including the expected time of completion for each topic, can be found in Appendix A. Following completion of all components, participants were able to download a certificate of completion, which could be used for continuing education credit.

Survey Tools

While the pre- and post-surveys were not piloted, the SAFECOM (AOTA, 2009a) was adapted to develop them. The original 69-question SAFECOM tool uses a 5-point Likert scale for fieldwork educators to assess their competency in the areas of professional practice (16 questions), education (14 questions), supervision (14 questions), evaluation (9 questions), and administration (16 questions). The pre- and post-survey were developed specifically for the purpose of comparing participant responses regarding their perceived preparedness as a fieldwork educator in the areas of education, supervision, evaluation, and administration, which aligned directly with the competency module content (the area of professional practice from the SAFECOM was omitted). Participants were required to rate their perceived level of competency using a 4-point Likert scale (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree). While psychometric properties of the SAFECOM have not been studied, it was developed by the COE and is recommended as one method clinicians should use to prepare for their role as a fieldwork educator (Dickerson, 2006). The full survey tool used for this study can be found in Appendix B. The survey questions were inserted into Qualtrics, and links to access the surveys were embedded within the Articulate Rise 360 platform. Participants were required to assign themselves a unique identifier code in the pre-survey, which was also used during the post-survey. This allowed data analysis to be completed while maintaining anonymity of the study participants.

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Data Analysis

Statistical analysis was completed using IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 26 (IBM Corporation, 2020). Descriptive statistics consisted of a description of the sample population (Taylor, 2017). Data that was analyzed and reported included the education level, years of clinical experience, type of setting currently working in, completion of continuing education specific to fieldwork education, as well as perceived preparedness related to the fieldwork educator competencies of education, supervision, evaluation, and administration. Frequency distributions and percentage values of pre- and post-survey responses were calculated (Taylor, 2017). Pre-and post-survey results of the Likert scale questions were examined further using the McNemar test (Sundjaja et al., 2022). To have a dichotomous variable needed to run the test, the responses from both the pre- and post-survey for “strongly agree” and “agree” were categorized as “agree”. Similarly, the responses from both surveys for “strongly disagree” and “disagree” were categorized as “disagree”. Validity of the findings were protected by using an existing tool (the SAFECOM) to develop the pre- and post-survey, using a variety of methods to recruit participants, and recruitment of participants from regions across the country.

Results

There were 30 participants who completed all three components and met the inclusion criteria for this study. However, 16 (*n*=16) established a unique identifier code that matched the pre- and post-survey. The responses from these 16 participants were used to complete the data analysis.

Demographics

Participants were recruited from across the country; however demographic results indicated that the majority were from the Midwest (68.75%; *n*=11). The respondents represented occupational therapists from a wide variety of practice settings including acute care, inpatient rehab, outpatient rehab, skilled nursing/sub-acute rehab, mental health, school-based, and community-based. Most of the participants reported that they had a master’s degree (56.25%; *n*=9), whereas 37.5% (*n*=6) had a bachelor’s degree, and 6.25% (*n*=1) had an entry-level doctorate. Survey results show that 68.75% (*n*=11) of the participants had engaged in continuing education related to their role as a fieldwork educator, while five had no previous continuing education in this area. Types of continuing education that the 11 participants reported included engagement in fieldwork educator workshops hosted by a consortium of academic fieldwork coordinators (43.75%; *n*=7) completion of AOTA’s Fieldwork Educator Certificate Program (18.75%; *n*=3), as well as an in-service provided by place of employment (12.5%; *n*=2). It should be noted that some participants reported completion of a variety of continuing education programs of those that were listed.

Education

One significant outcome within the category of *Education*, was related to the participants’ perceived preparedness to implement a professional development plan to increase knowledge and skills specific to their role as a fieldwork educator (Q13; $p < .05$). From the pre-survey, 62.5% (*n*=10) of the participants selected “disagree” as a response to this question, however following completion of the online learning module,

nine (56.25%) participants selected “agree” and 6 (37.5%) participants selected “strongly agree”. Regarding preparedness to use a variety of instructional strategies to facilitate the learning process (Q11; $p < .05$), in the pre-survey, five participants (31.25%) responded with “disagree”, whereas in the post-survey, one participant (6.25%) responded with “disagree”. The remaining 15 participants responded with either “agree” (37.5%; *n*=*6*) or “strongly agree” (56.25%; *n*=9). For Q10 (preparedness to sequence learning experiences to grade progression toward entry-level practice) and Q12 (preparedness to demonstrate sensitivity to student learning style to adapt teaching approach for diverse student populations), 100% of the participants responded with either “agree” or “strongly agree” on the post-survey. This was a change from two (12.5%) participants responding with “disagree” to Q10 and 3 (18.75%) participants responding with “disagree” to Q12 on the pre-survey. Table 1 shows the changes in level of preparedness from pre- to post-survey, related to the education competencies.

Supervision

One significant outcome within the *Supervision* category was related to the participants’ perceived preparedness to use current supervision models and theories to facilitate student performance and professional behavior (Q14; $p < .05$). Significance was also identified with participants’ preparedness to initiate interaction to resolve conflict and to raise issues of concern (Q20; $p < .05$). With regards to the participants’ preparedness to use a progression of supervisory approaches throughout the student learning cycle to facilitate student performance (Q18) the outcome was not significant ($p > .05$); however, 4 (25%) participants provided a response of “disagree” on the pre-survey and 1 (6.25) participant provided a response of “disagree” on the post-survey. The McNemar test could not be run for Q15-Q17, Q19, and Q21-Q24 since there was only 1 variable in the post-survey (Note: responses of “agree” and “strongly agree” were combined as “agree” during statistical analysis). Table 2 shows the changes in perceived preparedness from the pre- to the post-survey, specific to the supervision fieldwork educator competencies.

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Table 1

Changes in Level of Preparedness of Education Competencies

	Pre-Survey				Post-Survey				
Question Item	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	*p**
Q10. I feel well prepared to sequence learning experiences to grade progression toward entry-level practice.	0 (0)	2 (12.5)	10 (62.5)	4 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (56.25)	8 (50)	No score
Q11. I feel well prepared to use a variety of instructional strategies to facilitate the learning process (such as role play, modeling, co-treat, videotaping, etc.).	0 (0)	5 (31.25)	9 (56.25)	2 (12.5)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	6 (37.5)	9 (56.25)	**.04**
Q12. I feel well prepared to demonstrate sensitivity to student learning style to adapt teaching approach for diverse student populations.	0 (0)	3 (18.75)	9 (56.25)	4 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	No Score
Q13. I feel well prepared to self-identify and implement a Fieldwork Educator Professional Development plan to further my skills as a fieldwork educator.	0 (0)	10 (62.5)	3 (18.75)	2 (12.5)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	9 (56.25)	6 (37.5)	**.002**

Note. (n = 16); The numbers in the table indicate: Number of respondents (percentage). Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree. *: McNemar's test (Value < .05 is shown in bold). No Score is reported when McNemar's test could not be run due to there only being one variable in the post-survey (i.e., agree).

Table 2

Changes in Level of Preparedness of Supervision Competencies

	Pre-Survey				Post-Survey				
Question Item	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	*p**
Q14. I feel well prepared to use current supervision models and theories to facilitate student performance and professional behavior.	0 (0)	10 (62.5)	4 (25)	2 (12.5)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	8 (50)	7 (43.75)	**.003**
Q15. I feel well prepared to anticipate and prepare students for challenging situations.	1 (6.25)	1 (6.25)	9 (56.25)	5 (31.25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (68.75)	5 (31.25)	No Score
Q16. I feel well prepared to present clear expectations of performance throughout the fieldwork experience, appropriate to entry-level OT practice.	1 (6.25)	1 (6.25)	7 (43.75)	7 (43.75)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (56.25)	7 (43.75)	No Score
Q17. I feel well prepared to provide activities that challenge student's optimal performance.	0 (0)	3 (18.75)	9 (56.25)	4 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (50)	8 (50)	No Score
Q18. I feel well prepared to use a progression of supervisory approaches throughout the student learning cycle (adapts the amount and type of supervision, changes approach to support student learning, challenges student at current level of performance) to facilitate student performance.	0 (0)	4 (25)	7 (43.75)	5 (31.25)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	8 (50)	7 (43.75)	.08

https://encompass.eku.edu/jote/vol7/iss2/16
DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Q19. I feel well prepared to use a variety of strategies to provide communication and feedback to promote student professional development (verbal, non-verbal, group, direct, indirect).	0 (0)	2 (12.5)	10 (62.5)	4 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (50)	8 (50)	No Score
Q20. I feel well prepared to initiate interaction to resolve conflict and to raise issues of concern.	1 (6.25)	5 (31.25)	7 (43.75)	3 (18.75)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	8 (50)	7 (43.75)	**.02**
Q21. I feel well prepared to provide the student with prompt, direct, specific, and constructive feedback throughout the fieldwork experience.	0 (0)	3 (18.75)	11 (68.75)	2 (12.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (43.75)	9 (56.25)	No Score
Q22. I feel well prepared to identify personal style of supervision and to adapt the approach in response to the student's performance.	0 (0)	3 (18.75)	8 (50)	5 (31.25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (50)	8 (50)	No Score
Q23. I feel well prepared to collaborate with the student and academic fieldwork coordinator to identify and modify learning environments when student experiences difficulty.	0 (0)	6 (37.5)	6 (37.5)	4 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (43.75)	9 (56.25)	No Score
Q24. I feel well prepared to elicit and respond to student's feedback and concerns.	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	12 (75)	3 (18.75)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (50)	8 (50)	No Score

Note. (n = 16); The numbers in the table indicate: Number of respondents (percentage). Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree. *: McNemar's test (Value < .05 is shown in bold). No Score is reported when McNemar's test could not be run due to there only being one variable in the post-survey (i.e., agree).

Evaluation

Following completion of the online learning module, significant outcomes in this category were reported with the participants' ability to communicate and collaborate with the academic program to integrate the academic curriculum design during fieldwork (Q27; $p < .05$), to complete and provide the academic program with required paperwork in a timely manner (Q28; $p < .05$) and to use fieldwork evaluation tools to accurately measure student performance and provide feedback (Q31; $p < .05$). The McNemar test could not be run for Q25, Q26, Q29, and Q30, since there was only 1 variable in the post-survey (all responses were either "agree" or "strongly agree" to these questions on the post-survey). See Table 3 to review the changes in perceived preparedness from the pre- to the post-survey, specific to the evaluation fieldwork educator competencies.

Administration

Significance was identified in the outcome of Q33 ($p < .05$), which related to the participants' perceived preparedness to design and implement a fieldwork program in collaboration with the academic fieldwork coordinator in accordance with ACOTE Standards for Level II Fieldwork. Prior to completing the online learning module, 10 participants provided a response of either "strongly disagree" (12.5%; *n*=2) or "disagree" (50%; *n*=8). Whereas on the post-survey, 1 (6.25%) participant responded with "strongly disagree" and 1 (6.25%) participant responded with "disagree". The remaining 14 participants provided a response of either "agree" (56.25%; *n*=9) or "strongly agree" (31.25%; *n*=5) to Q33 on the post-survey. A significant change ($p < .05$) was also observed for Q34 (document an organized, systematic, fieldwork program), Q37 (identify the legal and health care policies that directly influence fieldwork, including fieldwork supervision guidelines), and Q38 (complete an orientation for the student to the fieldwork site, including policies, procedures, student expectations, responsibilities, etc.). Significance was not observed ($p > .05$) for Q 39, "I feel well prepared to conduct ongoing fieldwork program evaluations and monitor the change in the program with student and staff input (self-assessment, student assessment, etc.)." The McNemar test could not be run for Q32, Q35, and Q36, since there was only 1 variable in the post-survey (all responses were either "agree" or "strongly agree" to these questions on the post-survey). Results related to changes in the perceived level of preparedness from the pre- to the post-survey for administration fieldwork educator competencies are reported in Table 4.

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Table 3

Changes in Level of Preparedness of Evaluation Competencies

	Pre-Survey				Post-Survey				
Question Item	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	*p**
Q25. I feel well prepared to assess student according to performance standards based on objective information (e.g., direct observation, discussion with student, review of student's documentation, observation by others, etc.).	0 (0)	2 (12.5)	11 (68.75)	3 (18.75)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	No Score
Q26. I feel well prepared to facilitate student self-reflection and self-assessment throughout the fieldwork and evaluation process.	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	11 (68.75)	4 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	No Score
Q27. I feel well prepared to communicate and collaborate with academic programs to integrate the academic curriculum design during fieldwork.	1 (6.25)	7 (43.75)	6 (37.5)	2 (12.5)	1 (6.25)	0 (0)	8 (50)	7 (43.75)	**.008**
Q28. I feel well prepared to complete and provide the academic program with required paperwork (AOTA Data form, site-specific objectives, final performance evaluation, etc.) in a timely manner.	0 (0)	5 (31.25)	6 (37.5)	5 (31.25)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	6 (37.5)	9 (56.25)	**.04**

Q29. I feel well prepared to review the evaluation tool and expected entry-level expectations with the student prior to midterm and final.	0 (0)	4 (25)	7 (43.75)	4 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)	No Score
Q30. I feel well prepared to assess student's performance based on appropriate entry-level roles of the practice setting.	0 (0)	3 (18.75)	7 (43.75)	5 (31.25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (50)	8 (50)	No Score
Q31. I feel well prepared to use fieldwork evaluation tools to accurately measure student performance and provide feedback.	0 (0)	6 (37.5)	6 (37.5)	3 (18.75)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	7 (43.75)	8 (50)	**.02**

Note. (n = 16; one participant did not respond to pre-survey Q29, Q30, and Q31); The numbers in the table indicate: Number of respondents (percentage). Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree. *: McNemar's test (Value < .05 is shown in bold). No Score is reported when McNemar's test could not be run due to there only being one variable in the post-survey (i.e., agree).

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Table 4

Changes in Level of Preparedness of Administration Competencies

	Pre-Survey				Post-Survey				
Question Item	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	*p**
Q32. I feel well prepared to seek support from the academic fieldwork coordinator to develop and implement a student fieldwork program.	1 (6.25)	6 (37.5)	7 (43.75)	2 (12.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (43.75)	9 (56.25)	No Score
Q33. I feel well prepared to design and implement a fieldwork program in collaboration with the academic fieldwork coordinator in accordance with ACOTE Standards for Level II Fieldwork.	2 (12.5)	8 (50)	5 (31.25)	1 (6.25)	1 (6.25)	1 (6.25)	9 (56.25)	5 (31.25)	**.004**
Q34. I feel well prepared to document an organized, systematic, fieldwork program (fieldwork manual, student expectations and site-specific objectives, etc.).	2 (12.5)	6 (37.5)	7 (43.75)	1 (6.25)	1 (6.25)	1 (6.25)	7 (43.75)	7 (43.75)	**.01**
Q35. I feel well prepared to schedule formal and informal meetings with the student to guide the fieldwork experience.	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (68.75)	5 (31.25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (31.25)	11 (68.75)	No Score
Q36. I feel well prepared to collaborate with the student to develop student learning objectives.	0 (0)	4 (25)	9 (56.25)	3 (18.75)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (43.75)	9 (56.25)	No Score

Q37. I feel well prepared to identify the legal and health care policies that directly influence fieldwork, including fieldwork supervision guidelines.	1 (6.25)	8 (50)	4 (25)	3 (18.75)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	11 (68.75)	4 (25)	**.004**
Q38. I feel well prepared to complete an orientation for the student to the fieldwork site, including policies, procedures, student expectations, responsibilities, etc.	0 (0)	5 (31.25)	8 (50)	3 (18.75)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	8 (50)	7 (43.75)	**.04**
Q39. I feel well prepared to conduct ongoing fieldwork program evaluations and monitor the change in the program with student and staff input (self-assessment, student assessment, etc.).	0 (0)	4 (25)	10 (62.5)	2 (12.5)	0 (0)	1 (6.25)	9 (56.25)	6 (37.5)	.08

Note. (n = 16); The numbers in the table indicate: Number of respondents (percentage). Scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree. *: McNemar's test (Value < .05 is shown in bold). No Score is reported when McNemar's test could not be run due to there only being one variable in the post-survey (i.e., agree).

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Discussion

The purpose of this pilot study was to investigate the impact of *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module* on occupational therapists' perceived level of preparedness with respect to their role as fieldwork educators for Level II OT students. Analysis of the data showed the learning module had a positive impact on some of the participants' perceived level of preparedness, which is discussed in more detail below. This study was unique from existing literature, in that it included the use of an online learning module, designed by the researcher for occupational therapy practitioners, specifically for the purpose of improving their perceived level of preparedness as a fieldwork educator. Additionally, it was a preliminary pilot study that aimed to examine the effectiveness of the online learning module, providing evidence to support its use by occupational therapy programs and academic fieldwork coordinators.

Identified Areas of Need

The pre-survey results provided insight into the competency areas that occupational therapists felt least prepared as a fieldwork educator. A rating of "strongly disagree" was reported on the pre-survey with regards to (a) anticipate and prepare students for challenging situations; (b) present clear expectations of performance throughout the fieldwork experience; (c) initiate interaction to resolve conflict and raise issues of concern; (d) communicate and collaborate with academic programs to integrate the academic curriculum; (e) seek support from the academic fieldwork coordinator to develop a fieldwork program; (f) collaborate with the academic fieldwork coordinator to implement a fieldwork program in accordance to accreditation standards; (g) document an organized fieldwork program including a fieldwork manual, student expectations and site-specific objectives; and (h) identify legal and health care policies that directly influence fieldwork including supervision guidelines.

The identified areas of need stated above relate to what has previously been reported in the literature. Karp et al. (2022) found that most of the participants in their study stated that a structured facility-based fieldwork program would be necessary for them to take on the role as a fieldwork educator. In a study by Hanson (2011), when indicating the types of support that was valued before and during Level II OT Fieldwork placements, participants emphasized the need for ongoing communication and support from the academic fieldwork coordinator. They also stated it was important for expectations to be communicated to the student, expressed an interest in receiving information from the academic program regarding how the curriculum and accreditation standards are addressed, shared that it would be helpful to have an in-service on entry-level expectations, and specified the need for learning more about fieldwork supervision in general, including details about fieldwork forms, weekly expectations, site-specific objectives, among others. Additionally, the participants reported they needed more support and resources from the academic fieldwork coordinator on how to provide appropriate feedback, deal with conflict, manage challenging students, effectively use the fieldwork evaluation form, and how to tailor the fieldwork experience to fit each individual student's needs (Hanson, 2011). Furthermore, Chapman (2016) discussed how occupational therapists often enter the role of fieldwork educator without adequate preparation, lacking appropriate skills related to instructional design. This directly relates

to this study's results, as participants reported a lack of perceived preparedness with integrating the academic program's curriculum into the fieldwork experience, implement a fieldwork program in accordance with accreditation standards, as well as present clear expectations to students throughout the fieldwork experience. Varland et al. (2017) reported several factors that impact an occupational therapist's decision to supervise fieldwork students. The study by Varland et al. (2017) directly relates to the outcomes of this research, in that it indicated how education specific to being a fieldwork educator is a key solution to increasing a therapist's willingness to serve in this role. Many of the participants from Varland et al. (2017) discussed the need for more resources related to supervision strategies, learning styles, fieldwork expectations, addressing difficult student issues and how to facilitate learning.

Impact of Online Module

The learning module had a significant impact on participants' perceived preparedness with respect to the following: (a) implement a professional development plan, (b) use a variety of instructional strategies, (c) use current supervision models and theories (d) initiate interaction to resolve conflict, (e) communicate and collaborate with academic programs to integrate the academic curriculum, (f) complete and provide the academic program with required paperwork, (g) use fieldwork evaluation tools to accurately measure student performance and provide feedback, (h) design and implement a fieldwork program in collaboration with the academic fieldwork coordinator in accordance with ACOTE Standards, (i) document an organized, systematic, fieldwork program, (j) identify the legal and health care policies that directly influence fieldwork, and (k) complete an orientation for the student.

Mackenzie et al. (2001), examined the outcomes of a workshop designed for occupational therapy fieldwork supervisors in New South Wales, and reported that the workshop sessions that addressed learning styles, giving feedback, and goal setting, had the most positive impact on participants. Post-workshop feedback offered suggestions for future workshops, including alternative formats and topics of interest. Participants from Mackenzie et al. (2001) recommended that a self-directed workshop could be made available and proposed that workshops be recorded and shared virtually for those that could not attend in-person. Recommended future topics included assessment of student performance, supervision strategies, conflict resolution, working with students with disabilities, as well as the development of learning agreements when faced with struggling students (Mackenzie et al., 2001). The outcomes of the Mackenzie et al. (2001) study connect to the asynchronous design and topics of *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module*.

There were aspects of the online learning module that were less effective. Significant outcomes were not identified with the following: (a) prepared to use a progression of supervisory approaches throughout the student learning cycle (adapts the amount and type of supervision, changes approach to support student learning, challenges student at current level of performance) to facilitate student performance, and (b) prepared to conduct ongoing fieldwork program evaluations and monitor the change in the program with student and staff input (self-assessment, student assessment, etc.). Furthermore,

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

"strongly disagree" was observed from one participant as a post-survey response for the following: (a) prepared to communicate and collaborate with academic programs to integrate the academic curriculum design during fieldwork, (b) prepared to design and implement a fieldwork program in collaboration with the academic fieldwork coordinator in accordance with ACOTE Standards for Level II Fieldwork, and (c) prepared to document an organized, systematic, fieldwork program (fieldwork manual, student expectations and site-specific objectives, etc.).

Limitations

Limitations to the study design are as follows:

- There was the small sample size; therefore, this study represents only a portion of practicing occupational therapists, who were eligible to be fieldwork educators for Level II OT students. A small sample size was used for this pilot study to determine the feasibility of using the online module as a method of preparing occupational therapists to become fieldwork educators, as a step towards identifying best practices for preparing fieldwork educators.
- Geographically speaking, the results primarily represent the perceptions of occupational therapists living in the Midwest regions of the United States. Even though convenience and snowball sampling were used, recruitment was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, by limiting in-person networking at local and national conferences.
- Due to snowball sampling, there was no way to determine the total number of potential respondents or calculate a response rate.
- Since 11 of the 16 participants had previously completed continuing education specific to fieldwork education, it is difficult to determine if results were directly related to the completion of this study's online learning module. Additionally, this could account for responses of "agree" and "strongly agree" on the pre-survey.
- Other potential limitations related to the survey design include the length of the survey, time commitment to complete the online learning module, requirement to complete a second survey, and potential technological issues.

Limitations to the online learning module include:

- The module did not include knowledge checks along the way to check for understanding of content.
- Participants were not able to engage with others or ask clarifying questions.
- The researcher was unable to follow-up with participants to seek feedback about the online learning module design or content.
- The module was self-paced, which required participants to have self-discipline to complete.
- Participants were required to complete all content areas of the module, rather than have the choice to select content that was relevant based on self-rating of perceived preparedness on the pre-survey.
- The online learning module was only available in English.

Implications for Occupational Therapy Education

Results of this study revealed that the use of *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module* made a positive impact on the level of perceived preparedness of occupational therapists to serve as fieldwork educators for Level II OT students. This module could have implications on the fieldwork shortage reported in the literature due to a lack of clinicians who are both qualified and competent to serve as fieldwork educators (Evenson et al., 2015; Hunt & Kennedy-Jones, 2010; Kirke et al., 2007). Prior to the start of fieldwork rotations, the module could be shared electronically with all assigned fieldwork educators, so they have the option to complete if desired. Fieldwork educators could be instructed to complete the SAFCOM to determine their specific growth areas, so that they only need to complete the portions of the module that directly correlate to their areas of need. This module also serves as an accessible, low-cost, and flexible option for obtaining continuing education specific to fieldwork education. There is potential for sharing this online module with academic fieldwork coordinators across the country to be utilized in their regions, leading to an increased number of fieldwork educators prepared to design and implement effective learning experiences to many occupational therapy students.

Outcomes highlighted the competency areas that were identified as areas of need for fieldwork educators, which could be used to inform future implementation of the module. Additionally, the data showed which aspects of *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module* were most effective with regards to improving overall perceived preparedness. This leads the researcher to conclude that those parts of the module should be included if used in the future with other fieldwork educators for Level II occupational therapy students. Moreover, there may be aspects of the learning module that could be modified to enhance the overall effectiveness, as indicated by responses of “strongly disagree” and “disagree” from participants on the post-survey.

Future Research

This study illustrates one method that can be used to increase the perceived level of preparedness of occupational therapists in their role as a fieldwork educator. To determine the statistical significance in the overall effectiveness of *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module* specifically, future research should be conducted with an emphasis of increasing the sample size. Altering the inclusion criteria to allow for recent graduates with less than one-year clinical experience would be beneficial in an effort to increase the sample size, but to also determine if years of clinical experience impacts the perceived level of preparedness to serve as a fieldwork educator for Level II OT students. To examine whether clinical experience has an effect, one would also need to alter the survey to specifically require participants to report years of experience. Altering the inclusion and exclusion criteria to exclude participants who have had previous continuing education as a fieldwork educator should be considered. Future research could also be conducted to explore the perceptions of the participants with regards to the effectiveness of the asynchronous online learning module format along with the

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

module content. Results of such a study could have implications on determining the topics to include and the most effective method of content delivery. Additionally, a study comparing the results of an in-person workshop, versus completion of the online learning module could lead to a better understanding of best-practices for preparing occupational therapy practitioners to be effective fieldwork educators.

Conclusion

To ensure continuation of high-quality fieldwork education in the field of occupational therapy, identification of best practices for establishing fieldwork educator preparedness is critical. This pilot study aimed to evaluate the impact an online module had on the perceived preparedness of occupational therapists for their role as a fieldwork educator. Outcomes show that *The Fieldwork Educator Competency Module* had a positive impact on the perceived level of preparedness of some of the participants. This module could be an effective method that academic fieldwork coordinators can use to enhance the level of preparedness of occupational therapists with regards to serving as fieldwork educators, and by doing so, increase the number of therapists who are willing to be fieldwork educators for Level II OT students. If the online module is used, it would be recommended that fieldwork educators first complete the SAFECOM to identify specific areas of need. This would allow the academic fieldwork coordinator to determine which portions of the online module should be completed. Academic programs and academic fieldwork coordinators should consider the outcomes of this study in their own plans for ensuring fieldwork educator preparedness, as they indicate a positive impact using a low-cost, accessible, and flexible method.

References

Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education. (2018). *2018 Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE®) Standards and Interpretive Guide* (effective July 31, 2020) [PDF file]. https://www.aota.org/~/media/Corporate/Files/EducationCareers/Accredit/StandardsReview/2018-ACOTE-Standards-Interpretive-Guide.pdf

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2009a). *American Occupational Therapy Association Self-Assessment Tool for Fieldwork Educator Competency* [PDF file]. https://health.utah.edu/occupational-recreational-therapies/docs/fieldwork/selfassessmentfwedcompetency.pdf

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2009b). Occupational therapy fieldwork education: Value and purpose. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 63,* 821-822. https://doi.org:10.5014/ajot.63.6.821

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2010). *Practice advisory: Services provided by students in level II fieldwork settings* [PDF file]. https://www.aota.org/~/media/Corporate/Files/EducationCareers/Educators/Fieldwork/StuSuprvsn/Practice%20Advisory%20Services%20provided%20by%20students%20in%20FW%20Level%20II%20final.pdf

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2013). *COE guidelines for an occupational therapy fieldwork experience - Level II* [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.aota.org/~/media/Corporate/Files/EducationCareers/Educators/Fieldwork/LevelII/COE%20Guidelines%20for%20an%20Occupational%20Therapy%20Fieldwork%20Experience%20--%20Level%20II--Final.pdf

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2018). *Excellence in fieldwork criteria: Fieldwork educator.* https://www.aota.org/Education-Careers/ Fieldwork/ Supervisor/Excellence/Fieldwork-Educator.aspx

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2020a). *Fieldwork Performance Evaluation (FWPE) for the Occupational Therapy Student*. Bethesda, MD.

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2020b). *Level II fieldwork.* https://www.aota.org/Education-Careers/Fieldwork/LevelII.aspx

American Occupational Therapy Association. (2020c). *Recommended content for a student fieldwork manual [*PDF file]. https://www.miota.org/docs/Recommended_Content_FW_Manual.pdf

Armstrong, P. (2010). *Bloom's Taxonomy*. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/blooms-taxonomy/

Cantillon, P., & Sargeant, J. (2008). Giving feedback in clinical settings. *British Medical Journal*, 337, 1292-1294. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.a1961

Chapman, L. M. (2016). Transitioning from clinician to fieldwork educator. *SIS Quarterly Practice Connections, 1*(2), 31-33. https://www.mclennan.edu/health-professions/occupational-therapy-assistant/docs/Transitioning.pdf

Collins, J. (2004). Education techniques for lifelong learning: Principles of adult learning. *RadioGraphics, 24,* 1483-1489. https://doi.org/10.1148/rg.245045020

Commission on Education. (n.d.). *COE guidelines for an occupational therapy fieldwork experience: Level II* [PDF file]. https://www.aota.org/~/media/Corporate/Files/EducationCareers/Educators/Fieldwork/LevelII/COE%20Guidelines%20for%20an%20Occupational%20Therapy%20Fieldwork%20Experience%20--%20Level%20II--Final.pdf

Costa, D. M. (2015). *The essential guide to occupational therapy fieldwork education: Resources for educators and practitioners* (2nd ed.). American Occupational Therapy Association.

Cranwell, K., Hitch, D., & McKinstry, C. (2020). Reflective practice facilitation within occupational therapy supervision processes: A mixed method study. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 67*(4), 320-329. https://doi-org.ezproxy.gvsu.edu/10.1111/1440-1630.12660

Culatta, R. (2023). *Andragogy (Malcom Knowles).* InstructionalDesign.org. http://www.instructionaldesign.org/theories/andragogy/

Deluliis, E. D. & Hanson, D. (Eds.). (2023). *Fieldwork educator's guide to level II fieldwork.* SLACK Incorporated.

Dickerson, A. E. (2006). Role competencies for a fieldwork educator. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *60*(6), 650-651. http://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.60.6.650

Dunn, L. S., Arias, S., Beyer, A., Hermes, E., & Radcliff, S. (2020). Student perspectives of the effective behaviors of occupational therapy level II fieldwork educators. *Journal of Occupational Therapy Education, 4* (4). https://doi.org/10.26681/jote.2020.040408

Evenson, M. E., Roberts, M., Kaldenberg, J., Barnes, M. A., & Ozelie, R. (2015). National survey of fieldwork educators: Implications for occupational therapy education. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 69*(Suppl. 2), S1-S5. https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2015.019265

Gill, E. (2020, July 2). *What is your teaching style? 5 Effective teaching methods for your classroom*. Resilient Educator. https://resilienteducator.com/classroom-resources/5-types-of-classroom-teaching-styles/

Hanson, D., & Deluliis, E. D. (Eds.) (2023). *Fieldwork educator's guide to level I fieldwork.* SLACK Incorporated.

Hanson, D. J. (2011). The perspectives of fieldwork educators regarding level II fieldwork students. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care, 25*(2-3), 164-177. https://doi.org:10.3109/07380577.2011.561420

Hunt, K., & Kennedy-Jones, M. (2010). Novice occupational therapists' perceptions of readiness to undertake fieldwork supervision. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 57*, 394-400. https://doi.org:10.1111/j.1440-1630.2010.00859.x

IBM Corporation. (2020). *IBM SPSS Statistics* (Version 26). IBM Corporation.

Johnson, C., Haynes, C., & Opperman Ames, J. (2015). Supervision competencies for fieldwork education. In D. M. Costa (Ed.), *The essential guide to occupational therapy fieldwork education: Resources for educators and practitioners* (pp. 237-245). American Occupational Therapy Association.

Kadakia, C., & Owens, L. M. D. (2020). *Designing for modern learning: Beyond ADDIE and SAM.* Association for Talent Development.

Karp, P., Lavin, K. A., & Collins, T. (2022). Exploring fieldwork educator development: preparation methods and support tools. *Journal of Occupational Therapy Education, 6* (1). https://doi.org/10.26681/jote.2022.060113

Kirke, P., Layton, N., & Sim, J. (2007). Informing fieldwork design: Key elements to quality in fieldwork education for undergraduate occupational therapy students. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 54*, S13-S22. https://doi.org:10.1111/j.1440-1630.2007.00696.x

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2015). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Learning Theories. (2017). *Andragogy: Adult learning theory (Knowles).* https://www.learning-theories.com/andragogy-adult-learning-theory-knowles.html

Mackenzie, L., Zakrzewski, L., Walker, C., & McCluskey, A. (2001). Meeting the educational needs of fieldwork supervisors: A collaborative workshop developed by New South Wales occupational therapy fieldwork coordinators. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 48*, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1630.2001.00233.x

Roberts, M. E., Hooper, B. R., Wood, W. H., & King, R. M. (2014). An international systematic mapping review of fieldwork education in occupational therapy. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy, 82*(2), 106-118. https://doi.org:10.1177/0008417414552187

Ryan, K., Beck, M., Ungaretta, L., Rooney, M., Dalomba, E., & Kahanov, L. (2018). Pennsylvania occupational therapy fieldwork educator practices and preferences in clinical education. *Open Journal of Occupational Therapy, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.15453/2168-6408.1362

Stutz-Tanenbaum, P. & Hooper, B. (2009). Creating congruence between identities as a fieldwork educator and a practitioner. *Education Special Interest Section Quarterly, 19*(2), 1-4.

Sundjaja, J. H., Shrestha, R., & Krishan. K. (2022, July 18). *McNemar and Mann-Whitney U Tests*. StatPearls. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK560699/

Taylor, R. R. (2017). Deciding on an approach to data analysis. In R. R. Taylor (Ed.), *Research in occupational therapy: Methods for inquiry for enhancing practice* (2nd ed., pp. 330-341). F. A. Davis Company.

Varland, J., Cardell, E., Koski, J., & McFadden, M. (2017). Factors influencing occupational therapists' decision to supervise fieldwork students. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care, 31*(3), 238-254. http://doi.org/10.1080/07380577.2017.1328631

World Federation of Occupational Therapists. (2022). *WFOT approved education programmes.* WFOT. https://wfot.org/programmes/education/wfot-approved-education-programmes

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

Appendix A

Fieldwork Educator Competency Module Outline of Topics

I. Introduction: Purpose and Goals of Level II Fieldwork- 11.55 minutes
   a. Purpose and Goals of Fieldwork
      i. Professional behaviors, clinical skills, prepare for national board exam
      ii. Goal of Level II Fieldwork
      iii. Become an entry-level generalist practitioner
   b. Fieldwork Guidelines
      i. Program requirements, site requirements, accreditation requirements

II. Administration: Creating a Successful Fieldwork Program- 22.8 Minutes
   a. Explanation of Roles
      i. Roles of the academic fieldwork coordinator
      ii. Roles of the site coordinator (if applicable)
      iii. Roles of fieldwork educator
   b. Starting a New Fieldwork Program and Required Documents
      i. Affiliation Agreements
      ii. Required Documents per Accreditation
   c. Fieldwork Manual/Binder

III. Education: How to Facilitate Progression Towards Entry-Level Practice- 20.47 minutes
   a. Learning Theories and Learning Styles
   b. Identifying and Meeting the Needs of Students

IV. Supervision- Modifying Supervision Style to Match Student Needs- 36.32 Minutes
   a. Supervision Requirements
   b. Supervision Styles/Models
   c. Challenging Fieldwork Situations

V. Evaluation: Effective Tools for Student Evaluation and Feedback- 26.21 Minutes
   a. Feedback
   b. Formal Evaluation
   c. Evaluation of the Fieldwork Experience
      i. Student Evaluation of the Fieldwork Experience
      ii. Fieldwork Educator Self-Assessment

Appendix B

Survey Questions

1. Informed Consent

Inclusion Criteria

2. Are you a licensed or otherwise regulated occupational therapist with a minimum of 1-year practice experience as an occupational therapist?
    a. Yes
    b. No
3. Are you currently employed as a full-time occupational therapy practitioner?
    c. Yes
    d. No
4. In order to be able to complete a statistical analysis of the pre- and post-survey, you will need to create a unique identifier code. You will re-enter this code in the post-survey. The unique ID allows for statistical analysis, while remaining anonymous. Please use these guidelines to create your unique ID so that you will be able to remember for the post-survey.

    First letter of county of residence, year you graduated high school, second initial of last name, and year you graduated from your occupational therapy program.

Demographic Questions

5. In the past, have you participated in continuing education offerings specific to the role of fieldwork educator? (i.e.: AOTA Fieldwork Educator Certificate Workshop or workshops hosted by an academic program on topics related to fieldwork education).
    e. Yes
    f. No
6. If yes, please explain.
7. What is the highest academic degree you have earned?
    g. Bachelor's Degree
    h. Master's Degree
    i. Entry-level Doctorate Degree
    j. Post-professional Doctorate Degree
    k. Ph.D.
8. Which region of the country do you live in?
    l. Midwest - IA, IL, IN, KS, MI, MN, MO, ND, NE, OH, SD, WI
    m. Northeast - CT, DC, DE, MA, MD, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
    n. Southeast - AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, WV
    o. Southwest - AZ, NM, OK, TX
    p. West - AK, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, OR, UT, WA, WY

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

9. What type of setting do you work in? Check all that apply.
    q. Inpatient Rehab
    r. Acute Care
    s. Outpatient
    t. School
    u. Mental Health
    v. Community-based
    w. Other

Education Competencies

10. I feel well prepared to sequence learning experiences to grade progression toward entry-level practice.
    (1) Strongly Disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
11. I feel well prepared to use a variety of instructional strategies to facilitate the learning process (such as role play, modeling, co-treat, videotaping, etc.)
    (1) Strongly Disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly
12. I feel well prepared to demonstrate sensitivity to student learning style to adapt teaching approach for diverse student populations.
    (1) Strongly Disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
13. I feel well prepared to self-identify and implement a Fieldwork Educator Professional Development plan to further my skills as a fieldwork educator.
    (1) Strongly Disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree

Supervision Competencies

14. I feel well prepared to use current supervision models and theories to facilitate student performance and professional behavior.
    (1) Strongly Disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree

15. I feel well prepared to anticipate and prepare students for challenging situations.
    (1) Strongly Disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
16. I feel well prepared to present clear expectations of performance throughout the fieldwork experience, appropriate to entry-level OT practice.
    (1) Strongly Disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
17. I feel well prepared to provide activities that challenge student's optimal performance.
    (1) Strongly Disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
18. I feel well prepared to use a progression of supervisory approaches throughout the student learning cycle (adapts the amount and type of supervision, changes approach to support student learning, challenges student at current level of performance) to facilitate student performance.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
19. I feel well prepared to use a variety of strategies to provide communication and feedback to promote student professional development (verbal, non-verbal, group, direct, indirect).
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
20. I feel well prepared to initiate interaction to resolve conflict and to raise issues of concern.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
21. I feel well prepared to provide the student with prompt, direct, specific, and constructive feedback throughout the fieldwork experience.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

22. I feel well prepared to identify personal style of supervision and to adapt the approach in response to the student's performance.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
23. I feel well prepared to collaborate with the student and academic fieldwork coordinator to identify and modify learning environments when student experiences difficulty.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
24. I feel well prepared to elicit and respond to student's feedback and concerns.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree

Evaluation Competencies

25. I feel well prepared to assess student according to performance standards based on objective information (e.g., direct observation, discussion with student, review of student's documentation, observation by others, etc.).
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
26. I feel well prepared to facilitate student self-reflection and self-assessment throughout the fieldwork and evaluation process.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
27. I feel well prepared to communicate and collaborate with academic programs to integrate the academic curriculum design during fieldwork.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
28. I feel well prepared to complete and provide the academic program with required paperwork (AOTA Data form, site-specific objectives, final performance evaluation, etc.) in a timely manner.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree

29. I feel well prepared to review the evaluation tool and expected entry-level expectations with the student prior to midterm and final.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
30. I feel well prepared to assess student's performance based on appropriate entry-level roles of the practice setting.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
31. I feel well prepared to use fieldwork evaluation tools to accurately measure student performance and provide feedback.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree

Administrative Competencies

32. I feel well prepared to seek support from the academic fieldwork coordinator to develop and implement a student fieldwork program.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
33. I feel well prepared to design and implement a fieldwork program in collaboration with the academic fieldwork coordinator in accordance with ACOTE Standards for Level II Fieldwork.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
34. I feel well prepared to document an organized, systematic, fieldwork program (fieldwork manual, student expectations and site-specific objectives, etc.).
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
35. I feel well prepared to schedule formal and informal meetings with the student to guide the fieldwork experience.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree

DOI: 10.26681/jote.2023.070216

36. I feel well prepared to collaborate with the student to develop student learning objectives.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
37. I feel well prepared to identify the legal and health care policies that directly influence fieldwork, including fieldwork supervision guidelines.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
38. I feel well prepared to complete an orientation for the student to the fieldwork site, including policies, procedures, student expectations, responsibilities, etc.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree
39. I feel well prepared to conduct ongoing fieldwork program evaluations and monitor the change in the program with student and staff input (self-assessment, student assessment, etc.).
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly Agree