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Innovative Fieldwork Designs
for the New Centennial

Conference Objectives

- AOTA Updates, including results & implications from national survey of fieldwork educators
- Recognize variety of ‘traditional’ as well as innovative models of fieldwork supervision
- Explore strategies & potential benefits of implementing innovative approaches to fieldwork education
- Describe structures & processes that support collaborative intra- & inter-professional Level I & Level II fieldwork
- Review pilot study outcomes & next steps for collaborative intra-professional (OT/OTA) Level II fieldwork research study
- Determine possible innovations to enhance your fieldwork education program

AOTA updates

- Celebrating 100 years next year!
- 4 points of entry into profession anticipated 2019 (AA, BS for OTA & MS, OTD for OTR)
- OT Residency
- FWPE revision/validation study-in process
- Developing forms:
  - Revised SEFWE, LI Competencies
- Vision 2025
Vision 2025…

“Occupational therapy maximizes health, well-being, and quality of life for all people, populations, and communities through effective solutions that facilitate participation in everyday living” (AOTA Conference, Chicago, 2016)

Fieldwork Capacity & Retention

Results of a National Survey

National Survey of Fieldwork Educators: Implications for Occupational Therapy Education
AJOT Brief Report – October 2015

COE Appointed Task Group: Fieldwork Capacity & Retention

Study Investigators:
Michael Roberts, Regis College
Mary Evenson, MGH IHP
Jennifer Kaldenberg, Boston University
Rebecca Ozelie, Rush University
Mary Alicia Barnes, Tufts University
Background

National Enrollment Data – Need for Placements!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OT student enrollment total 2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # needing placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum # Level II placements needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Will also require Doctoral experiential

Purpose of Study - Objectives

Gain information on:
- Capacity of sites/FW Educators to work with students
- FW Educator perceptions of benefits & challenges associated with fieldwork
- Factors effecting collaborative relationship between academia & practice

Overall aim:
- Inform development of supports to address needs of all stakeholders (FW Sites, FW Educators, Students, Academic Programs)
Methods

- National Survey administered via Qualtrics online survey software
- Tufts IRB approved
- Snow-ball sampling method (Fall 2013)
  - Academic Fieldwork Coordinators (AFC) at 48 programs across 42 states in continental U.S asked to email survey to all FW contacts (who could also forward to other practitioners)

Survey: Participant Demographics

- 1,101 respondents opened online survey; 817 completed survey (74% response rate)
  - 85% Occupational Therapists
  - 5% Occupational Therapy Assistants
  - 10% identified as ‘other’
  - 59% Student Program Coordinator (map – next slide)
  - 88% had experience as FW Educator
  - 12% reported no experience
  - 96% reported setting currently takes fieldwork students
  - 54% reported practice in teaching institutions

Site Fieldwork Coordinators responding to survey, n=455. 41 states and D.C. included
Practice Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Setting</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Public</td>
<td>141%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Agency</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Rural</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Rural School</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF Private Rural</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Results

Level I Fieldwork: Preferences

What are the preferred timeframes to take Level I students for fieldwork placements?

- Mid-semester (40%)
- Other [no preference, anytime, not sure] (37%),
- End of semester (29%)
- Start of classes (12%).

What are the preferred formats to take Level I students for fieldwork placements?

- Week-long (53%)
- Weekly (41%)
- Other [2-week, no preference, blocks of 3-4 hours, flexible] (18%)
### Preferred Timeframes: Level II Fieldwork

*What are the preferred timeframes to take Level II students for fieldwork placements?*

- Fall (58%)
- Winter (54%)
- Spring (53%)
- Summer (29%)

### Models of OT Level II Student Supervision Provided & Preferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Provide %</th>
<th>Prefer %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 FWE: 1 OTS</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FWEs: 1 OTS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT – primary; other secondary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FWE: 2 OTS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FWEs: 2 OTS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Models of OTA Level II Student Supervision Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 OTR/L: 1 OTAS</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 COTA/L: 1 OTAS</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OTR/L: 2 OTAS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 COTA/L: 2 OTAS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 OTR/L: OTAS group</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fieldwork Educator Certificate Program Completion

How many staff at your site have completed the AOTA Fieldwork Educator Certificate Course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>OTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: # of LII OTS/year per site (57% reporting; n=472)

- LII OTS/yr_Zero: 25%
- LII OTS/yr_One: 9%
- LII OTS/yr_Two: 17%
- LII OTS/yr_Three: 20%
- LII OTS/yr_4-6: 14%
- LII OTS/yr_7-9: 5%
- LII OTS/yr_10-15: 6%
- LII OTS/yr_16plus: 4%

Results: # of LII OTAS/year per site (41% reporting; n=339)

- LII OTAS/yr_Zero: 29%
- LII OTAS/yr_One: 20%
- LII OTAS/yr_Two: 9%
- LII OTAS/yr_Three: 33%
- LII OTAS/yr_4-6: 7%
- LII OTAS/yr_7-9: 1%
- LII OTAS/yr_10-15: 7%
- LII OTAS/yr_16plus: 4%
## Perceived challenges with having fieldwork students

Rated 1 to 4 with 1: Not Challenging to 4: Highly Challenging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Highly challenging</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload pressures/time</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical space/available room/desk/computer</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about student capabilities</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Perceived Benefits

Rated 1 to 4 with 1: Not Beneficial to 4: Highly Beneficial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Highly beneficial</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to update practice/keep current/apply new ideas, research, theories</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction/reward</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give back to university/profession</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to develop clinical reasoning</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to develop supervision skills</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Most Valued Supports from Academic Programs

Rated 1 to 4 with 1: Not Beneficial to 4: Highly Beneficial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Highly beneficial</th>
<th>Total Response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness-high quality educational preparation of student</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of AFC by phone/email</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free conferences on issues related to FW education</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student completion of FW Seminar before placement</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face meeting with student &amp; FW Ed if needed</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular check-in by faculty/AFC</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course vouchers</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On site continuing ed</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion: Implications

- Summer is least preferred time for Level II Fieldwork vs. Fall/Winter/Spring
- Concerns about student capabilities
- OT versus OTA supervising OTA students
- Further research needed into why collaborative model fieldwork is underutilized
- Collaboration (site/academic program) & providing support (FW Ed/student) key roles for AFC & Site FW Coordinators

Limitations

- Results are 2+ years old; anecdotal reports of increasing fieldwork shortage, re: rescheduling canceled placements
- Did not include items about:
  - Cancellation rates
  - Policies/reasons sites limiting number of OT program contracts (# of schools sites affiliate with/why)
  - # of times sites need to turn down requests for placements
  - Small response from individuals/sites that do not take fieldwork students
  - Very little data about entry-level OTD placements

Recommendations

- Support developing fieldwork in community-based, emerging practice areas – home health, day programs, private practice
- Promote awareness of AOTA FWECP & website resources http://www.aota.org/Education-Careers/Fieldwork.aspx
- Train more OT & OTA Fieldwork Educators
- Further study & dissemination of information re: experiences of Fieldwork Educators (benefits, challenges)
- Question feasibility of offering 3rd Level II (in ELM programs that still offer/require this option)
- Encourage & support use of collaborative FW models
Conclusions

• Valuable information regarding needs & strategies to strengthen collaborative relationship with fieldwork facilities
• Preliminary evidence can be used to provide justification to administration in academic or practice site when advocating for time needed for Fieldwork Coordination role
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AOTA Enrollment data:


Traditional 1:1 Model of Supervision

- 1 OT/OTA educator to 1 OT/OTA student
- Increase in need of placements = Need to vary models of supervision

Multiple Sites Model

- 1 OT/OTA student at 2 or more sites
- School systems/early intervention/day camps/clinic
- Out-patient/home care

Overview of Other FW Models

- Multiple Mentor
- Hybrid Multiple Mentor Collaborative Model
- Collaborative Model
- Group Collaborative Model
- Interprofessional LI & LII FW Model
Multiple Mentor

- 2 OT/OTA educators to 1 OT/OTA student
- Vacation/part-time/varied caseload

Hybrid Multiple Mentor Collaborative Model

- 2 OTR educators to 1 OT and 1 OTA student
- Shared supervisory experience + different levels of OT
- Professional growth and development

Collaborative Model

- 1 OT educator to 1 OT and 1 OTA student
- Timing of placement
- Clinical, communicative, and leadership skill development
Group Collaborative Model

- 1 OT/OTA educator to a group of 4-6 OT/OTA students
- Variety of settings/psychosocial and MH
- Collaboration with other universities

Interprofessional Model

- Multi-disciplinary group model
- 4-6 OT/OTA students
- Role-emerging fieldwork
- Examples of role-emerging fieldwork
- Role of OT educator
- Role of site supervisor

Collaborative Intraprofessional OT/OTA Level II Fieldwork
NEOTE Conference June 16th, 2016
Adapted from MAOT Conference, October 2015

Mary Alicia Barnes, MS, OTR/L, Tufts University
Kim Bushey, MSEd, OTR/L & Maureen Nardella, MS, OTR/L
North Shore Community College
Jean MacLachlan, PhD, OTR/L, Salem State University
Objectives

- Describe structures & processes that can support collaborative intraprofessional OT/OTA Level II fieldwork
- Examine pilot study outcomes
- Identify next steps for study of collaborative OT/OTA Level II fieldwork

Intraprofessional Education & Practice

“effective intraprofessional relationships enhance the quality of occupational therapy services provided”

(Dillon, 2001, p. 1)

Essential Elements of Intraprofessional Practice:
- mutual respect for individual/professional role
- effective 2-way communication
- professionalism

Purpose of Research Study

- Develop & implement Level II Fieldwork (FW) experience that integrates students from OT & OTA programs in collaborative learning, supervision, & practice
- Promote shared student learning, enhance student engagement & responsibility in supervisory process
- Facilitate intraprofessional understanding, respect, & collaboration needed for effective occupational therapy service delivery
**Definition: Collaborative Learning**

“peers or small groups engaging in reciprocal learning experiences, whereby knowledge & ideas are exchanged” (Rozsa & Lincoln, 2005, p. 229)

- Student roles flex between teacher & learner
- Supervisor facilitates & guides learning by creating environment
- No competition involved

---

**Process of Research Study**

- Review of literature on collaborative fieldwork, supervision, OT/OTA roles, & intraprofessional education to define constructs
- Develop forms to supplement/structure learning
  - Required Readings
  - Collaborative LII Student Expectations
  - Peer Intervention Observation Form
  - Peer Documentation Feedback Form
  - Weekly Collaborative Supervision Form

---

**Process of Research Study (continued)**

- Implementation of Study
  - Recruitment of sites (convenience sample)
  - Alignment of student start dates
  - Obtain FWEd & students’ consents
  - Provide reading list & copies of forms designed to supplement/structure learning
  - Administer pre & post surveys
**Process of Research Study (continued)**

- **Data Analysis**
  - Multiple single subject design (pre-post test)
  - Statistical Analysis:
    - Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test per subject
    - T-test per participant cohort (OT/OTA/FWEd)

---

**t Values for FWE Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; N=7

---

**t Values for OTA results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; N=6
Satisfaction (0-100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FW Exp</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Supervision Form</th>
<th>Peer Int Obs Form</th>
<th>Peer Doc Rev Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall (n=19)</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW Ed (n=7)</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTS (n=6)</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTAS (n=6)</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits Reported by All Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits [of collaborative OT/OTA Level II]</th>
<th>FW Ed(s)</th>
<th>OT/s</th>
<th>OTA/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback &amp; preparing for supervision – peer support; enhanced ability to give &amp; receive feedback; enhanced security, comfort &amp; confidence</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned from each other - enhanced reflection, processing &amp; learning; more independent; enhanced security, comfort &amp; confidence; challenged development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted treatment planning, implementation &amp; group leadership</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared students for future collaborative OT/OTA practice - enhanced teamwork skills; developed strong professional relationship based on mutual trust &amp; respect</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly recommend collaborative OT/OTA FW (for all settings)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benefits [of collaborative OT/OTA Level II] FW Ed(s) OT/s OTA/s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>FW Ed(s)</th>
<th>OT/s</th>
<th>OTA/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted better problem solving &amp; clinical reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW documents effective for providing feedback [documentation review form; clinical observation form; collaborative supervision form]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted supervisory experience &amp; skill development</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted accountability - enhanced time management</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor responsibilities shared by students [collaborative process] lessening some aspects of FW Educator’s workload; created more of a self-directed learning process; created more independence in students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drawbacks Reported by All Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawback</th>
<th>FW Ed(s)</th>
<th>OT/s</th>
<th>OTA/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start dates – varying [OT/OTA students start at same time or OT student start 4 weeks before OTA student]</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation Review form</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential drawback if students not compatible</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Limitations

- Self report
- Convenience sample
- Small sample size
- Survey tool: Non standardized
Next Steps

- Facilitate replications of pilot study (within OT/OTA & amongst OT/OTA programs)
- Site recruitment expand to school based practice, skilled nursing facilities, specialty practice areas
- Explore options for future research on collaborative intraprofessional level II fieldwork

References/Recommended Readings
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Panel Presenters

MaryAnn Biele, MBA, MS, OTR/L, Occupational Therapist, William H. Lincoln School & OT Coordinator, Public Schools of Brookline, MA; Multiple Mentor Model

Elizabeth Ford, MOT, OTR/L, Occupational Therapist & Fieldwork Coordinator, Butler Hospital, RI; Group Collaborative Model

Lynn Krisko, MS, OTR/L, Rehab Manager & Clinical Education Coordinator, Spaulding Hospital, Cambridge, MA; Collaborative Model

Anna Martin, MOT, OTR/L, Fieldwork Coordinator & Julie Savoyski, MS, OTR/L, United Cerebral Palsy of Metro Boston; Hybrid Multiple Mentor Collaborative Model

Kelly Redwine-DePierre MS, OTR/L Program Coordinator, Kempels Center, Portsmouth, NH; Interprofessional Fieldwork Model (Level I & Level II)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Mentor; 2 FW Ed: 1 Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MaryAnn Biele, MBA, MS, OTR/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT Coordinator, Public Schools of Brookline, MA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:** Have used Multiple Mentor Model for 8+ years

- **Why?**
  - OTs more likely to agree to be FW educators due to:
    - Shared responsibility for student
    - Remain connected to their caseloads
  - Student exposed to varied:
    - Populations across district
    - Supervision styles
    - Therapeutic/interpersonal styles interacting with children & school staff
  - Student is able to have supervision if one educator is absent

**Challenges:**

- Student complains about one supervisor to other
- Student feels overloaded
- FW educator expectations are different
- FW educators don't agree regarding midterm/final grade

**Successes:**

- Student able to discuss cases with different educators
- Student able to share resources among sites
- Student exposed to other school system staff/professionals
- FW educators make sure student has multiple opportunities to address goals/growth areas
- FW educators grow professionally in role of mentor as collaborate together to support student
Multiple Mentor FW; 2 FW Ed: 1 Student
MaryAnn Biele, MBA, MS, OTR/L
OT Coordinator, Public Schools of Brookline, MA

Strategies that help make it work/worthwhile:
• Clear expectations – Fieldwork manual at each site
• Communication (3-way) regarding workload (weekly)
• Communication regarding assessments/evaluation tools
• Team approach to delivering midterm & final
• Close documentation & communication when potential of not passing

Future directions/plans:
• Increase # of therapists w/ Fieldwork Educator certificate
• Possible role of special education administrators as educators of doctorate students assigned to district

Hybrid Multiple Mentor Collaborative Model
Anna Martin, OTR/L, MOT; FW Coordinator; Julie Savoyski, MS, OTR/L, MPA: UCPMB Day Services

Background:
• Hybrid Multiple Mentor Collaborative:
  • 2 OTR/L FW Eds: 1 OT/s & 1 OTA/s
  • Have accepted multiple Level I & Level II OT & OTA students over past 4 years
• Why?
  • Co-supervise, since now both work part-time
  • Facilitates additional layer of student growth & professionalism

Hybrid Multiple Mentor Collaborative Model
Anna Martin, OTR/L, MOT; FW Coordinator; Julie Savoyski, MS, OTR/L, MPA: UCPMB Day Services

Why?
• Prior to participation in OT/OTA Collaborative LII research study, observed positive informal collaboration & role clarification develop between overlapping OT/OTA students
• Participation in study allowed us to see if outcomes matched our informal observations
Hybrid Multiple Mentor Collaborative Model
Anna Martin, OTR/L, MOT; FW Coordinator; Julie Savoyski, MS, OTR/L, MPA: UCPMB Day Services

Challenges:
• Some students may need more dedicated 1:1 time or support in building a collaborative relationship

Successes:
• Due in part to flexible & collaborative nature of student(s)
• OT/OTA students develop strong connection & deepen each other’s learning experiences

Strategies that help make it work/worthwhile:
• Use weekly expectation/area of focus schedule with students
• Align OT/OTA schedules week to week, so students together at all points possible (for 8 weeks)

Future directions:
• Continue to actively seek out times for our Level II OT/OTA students to overlap

Collaborative Model
Lynn Krisko, MS, OTR/L, Rehab Manager & Clinical Ed Coordinator, Spaulding Hospital, Cambridge, MA

Background:
• Rehab Manager -Brain injury, Neuro & Complex Medical units; Long term Acute Care
• OT:OT & OT:OTA models:
  • OT:OT model on & off for past 16 years
  • OT:OTA model once as part of a research project
• Using these models to assist with challenges of fieldwork site availability & to challenge staff
Collaborative Model
Lynn Krisko, MS, OTR/L, Rehab Manager & Clinical Ed Coordinator, Spaulding Hospital, Cambridge, MA

Challenges:
- Performance evaluations time consuming for FW Educator
- Increased caseload for supervisor to keep track of at end
- Making sure each student is able to carry own caseload
- Students not open-minded about alternative method of supervision
- Student learning styles vary greatly
- Different clinical requirements for OT:OTA students

Successes:
- Teaching opportunity for staff
- Develop group supervision skills
- Peer support for students
- Questions to supervisor are well thought out, increasing clinical reasoning skills
- Students develop working relationship with peers
- Students learn from each other
- Better understanding & appreciation of OT:OTA relationship

Strategies that make it worthwhile:
- Set established guidelines for each week for caseload advancement, supervision & peer interaction time
- Flexibility
- Facility supported cooperation
- Successful completion of a collaborative model, where each student has grown into a confident individual OT/OTA
Collaborative Model
Lynn Krisko, MS, OTR/L, Rehab Manager & Clinical Ed Coordinator, Spaulding Hospital, Cambridge, MA

Future directions/plans:
• Continue to educate staff regarding benefits of collaborative model of supervision
• Encourage staff to continue with or try the collaborative model
• Further discussion with OT/OTA schools to better determine logistics of start date & willingness of schools to share in this experience

Group Collaborative Model
Beth Ford, MOT, OTR/L; Fieldwork Coordinator, Butler Hospital

Background:
• Used for 20+ years in setting-small changes made over time

Why?
• Started due to decreased number of staff members
• Continues to meet needs of client, staff, & student populations

Challenges:
• Creates fast paced learning environment which challenges students to be active learners who advocate for themselves
• Easy for a student to slip ‘under the radar’ if they so choose
• Students initially may become upset if feel are not getting good understanding of OT (particularly if used to traditional model & physical medicine setting)

Successes:
• Allows us to provide additional services & groups
• Number of students keeps department more visible on each unit & more connected to day-to-day as well as ‘big picture’
• Students assist with research & maintaining EBP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Collaborative Model</th>
<th>Group Collaborative Model</th>
<th>Group Collaborative Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Ford, MOT, OTR/L; Fieldwork Coordinator, Butler Hospital</td>
<td>Beth Ford, MOT, OTR/L; Fieldwork Coordinator, Butler Hospital</td>
<td>Kelly Redwine-DePierre MS, OTR/L; Program Coordinator, Krempels Center Portsmouth, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies that help make it work/worthwhile:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strategies that help make it work/worthwhile:</strong></td>
<td>Interprofessional Model a multi-disciplinary group supervision model incorporating:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Organization key w/ up to 35 Level II & 40 Level I students/year! | - Students bring energy, creativity, new ideas & interpretations | - Speech therapy  
- Therapeutic recreation  
- Psychology  
- Social work  
- Cognitive neuroscience  
- Expressive therapy  
- Occupational therapy |
| - Students start at AOTA start dates so can start groups at same time | - For every challenging & time consuming student, there are easily 10 students that make my day-to-day work life easier | |
**Interprofessional Level I & Level II FW**
Kelly Redwine-DePierre MS, OTR/L; Program Coordinator, Krempels Center Portsmouth, NH

**Background:**
- Have used the Interprofessional FW Model 12 + years
- **Why?**
  - Brain injury survivors benefit from multi-disciplinary team approach due to complexity of brain injury diagnoses
  - Interns benefit from early exposure to other professions & learn to identify their roles as well as appreciate value of collaborative approach within a community based setting

**Challenges:**
- Majority of interns complete internship requirement 1x/wk, limiting opportunities to acclimate to practice setting
- Accommodating 40-45 interns per semester (also a success!)

**Successes:**
- Interns report better understanding of their role & role of other disciplines within this type of setting
- Clients benefit from group programming from a variety disciplines that addresses barriers & goals
- Interns have opportunity to be in-charge of program initiatives (events, projects, & functions)
- Members who are no longer eligible for insurance based services can receive 1:1 goal oriented support from future clinicians excited about their field

**Strategies that help make it work/worthwhile:**
- Being organized
- Supervisory responsibilities shared by 2 different disciplines as well as university faculty members
- Strong communication with academic departments
- Morning & afternoon group supervisions to address “curriculum” topics, planning for future groups/sessions & processing client interactions

**Future directions/plans:**
- Incorporating interns into research collaboratives
- Developing & sharing “Krempels Center” model of practice, including internship model, to promote increased access to community-based programming for BI survivors
12:00-1:00

LUNCH & Networking

1:00-1:30

• NEOTEC AWARDS
  • Irene Allard
  • Certificate of Appreciation

1:30-2:15

Small group breakout by Model

• Multiple Mentor
• Group Collaborative Model
• Collaborative Model
• Hybrid Multiple Mentor Collaborative Model
• Interprofessional LI & LI FW Model
2:15-2:45

Large Group Sharing
• Opportunities of model discussed:
  • What’s needed for implementation
  • Next steps for implementation

• ‘Ah ha’ Moments
• Additional fieldwork opportunities/ideas

Thank you!
• Wrap Up
• Conference Evaluation
• CE certificates