

Report of the Blueprint Adoption and Dissemination Task Group to the AOTA Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of OT Education

The Blueprint Task Group was assembled in April 2012 and met via eight conference calls from June through December 2012. Members were:

- Diane Parham, Chair, University of New Mexico
- Christine Berg, Washington University in St. Louis
- Lea Brandt, Missouri Health Professions Consortium
- Katherine Dimitropoulou, Long Island University
- Maureen Nardella, North Shore Community College (Massachusetts)

The specific charge was to make recommendations to the Ad Hoc Committee in response to the following questions:

- How has the Blueprint been used to inform OT and OTA education?
- When educational programs have used the document, what were their outcomes?
- Is the document compatible with ACOTE Standards?
- Is the content in the document being considered and adopted by programs?
- Should COE bring formal action to the RA for adoption?

In order to gather information needed to meet this charge, the Blueprint Task Group conducted a faculty survey that addressed the questions regarding applications and usefulness of the Blueprint in OT and OTA education. Responses of 748 faculty in OT and OTA programs were analyzed to create a picture of faculty perceptions of the Blueprint document via quantitative summaries of Likert scale responses and qualitative analyses of open-ended responses. To address the question regarding compatibility of the Blueprint with ACOTE Standards, we conducted a content analysis and comparison of the two documents. Results of the survey and content analysis were used to generate our recommendations.

In this report, a brief integrative summary of findings is presented first, followed by recommendations. Supporting data are then discussed in detail. Appendices contain a content analysis matrix of Blueprint and ACOTE Standards compatibility (Appendix A, pp. 13-15), and individual item analyses for qualitative (Appendix B, pp. 16-30) and quantitative (Appendix C, pp. 31-53) survey questions. The entire on-line survey also can be viewed in Appendix C.

Executive Summary

As many as one-third of faculty (OT and OTA combined) may be unaware of the existence of the Blueprint document. Use of the Blueprint document is generally very low, even among faculty who are aware of this document. Some faculty express interest in using it but are deterred by lack of clarity regarding its purpose and how to actually apply this document to curriculum or program development. Many who use it seem to do so only to check and validate what they are already doing, rather than to guide the development or evolution of the curriculum. It is clear that other documents within and outside the OT profession are much more influential than the Blueprint in OT and OTA academic program development, particularly the ACOTE Standards and the Occupational Therapy Practice Framework (OTPF).

Because the Blueprint is a relatively new document, long-term outcomes of Blueprint use with respect to alumni practice patterns cannot yet be ascertained. More immediate impacts of Blueprint use on curriculum design or program development are very limited. A small number of programs may have benefitted from Blueprint use by expanding the curriculum to include person-centered content such as spirituality, and environment-centered content such as community support and development.

The Blueprint document is compatible with ACOTE Standards (i.e., these documents do not conflict with each other), but it is not clear how they might be used together, along with other key documents such as the OTPF and Model Curriculum, in the process of curriculum design or program development. Although some faculty assert that AOTA should put no further resources into Blueprint dissemination or development, others suggest that it may be useful for AOTA to develop resource materials and workshops for faculty that demonstrate, with specific examples, how documents including the Blueprint may be used in an integrative fashion to guide curriculum and program development.

Recommendations

Our recommendations fall under two headings posed as questions. The first question was a direct charge to the task group. The second question was created by the task group to help focus AOTA planning regarding the future of the Blueprint document.

Should COE bring formal action to the RA for adoption?

No, we do not recommend this action, as it would not resolve the key problems that we found regarding usefulness of the Blueprint: (1) the purpose of the Blueprint document is not clear to faculty, and (2) faculty do not know how to use this document in curriculum development, in conjunction with other relevant documents such as the ACOTE Standards, OTPF, and Model Curriculum. Although some faculty use and value the Blueprint, a more prevalent viewpoint is that the Blueprint is “one more document” that brings little if any value to the process of curriculum development. We are concerned that pushing for adoption of the Blueprint at the current time may be counterproductive, considering that few faculty understand or appreciate this document.

Should the Blueprint document be advocated by AOTA in any form? If so, in what form and how?

We recommend that AOTA focus on addressing a key problem we uncovered: that faculty generally do not know how to use the Blueprint document, in concert with other relevant documents, to design and reshape curricula in ways that will move the profession toward the Centennial Vision. Instead of specifically advocating for use of the Blueprint document, we recommend that AOTA should promote use of a comprehensive process of curriculum development, emphasizing how to use multiple curriculum design tools in an integrated, ongoing fashion. This recommendation builds on the strong endorsement by faculty (82% of 546 responses) of the following strategy to maximize the usefulness of the Blueprint document: *“Revise into a resource guide with concrete examples of applications that align Blueprint content with ACOTE Standards, Model Curriculum, OTPF, and/or AOTA Level II FW Performance Evaluation”* (survey item 26). This particular endorsement suggests creation of a new resource guide that demonstrates how multiple documents, including Blueprint content, can be integrated with ACOTE Standards and other documents to plan curricula. In this strategy, Blueprint content would be merged into a more comprehensive guide to curriculum development that emphasizes the process of building and maintaining the quality and currency of a curriculum. Ideally, faculty could access the integrated resource guide to curriculum development and related documents in one location, such as the AOTA web site.

Within a comprehensive guide to curriculum development, Blueprint content could aid with selecting and integrating specific knowledge into curricula and specific courses so that ACOTE Standards are met and new OT and OTA graduates are prepared for practice that aligns with the Centennial Vision. Here is an example to demonstrate how the integration of Blueprint content with current ACOTE Standards might look, with respect to Master's Degree OT and OTA Standard B2.9: "Express support for the quality of life, well-being, and occupation of the individual, group, or population to promote physical and mental health and prevention of injury and disease considering the context (e.g., cultural, personal, temporal, virtual) and environment." The Blueprint could assist faculty in developing curricular and course content relative to this standard in several ways:

- identification of relevant topics and corresponding concepts within specific person-centered, environment-centered, and occupation-centered Blueprint factors;
- integration of these topics and concepts into the curriculum, with reference to specific scientific bases for current knowledge; and
- recognition that particular aspects of the curriculum may need to be revised or further supplemented to assist students in developing skill sets that can be implemented in various areas of practice.

Our data showed that the OTPF is almost as widely used in curriculum development as the Standards. This finding was interesting, as the OTPF is designed to be a template for practice, rather than education. Whereas ACOTE Standards present the minimum requirements for program accreditation, the OTPF presents a structure for organizing practice from an occupation-focused, client-centered perspective. However, the OTPF does not offer a community-based practice orientation that the Blueprint strongly supports. Additionally, the Blueprint contains content related to professionalism and professional communication, which is missing from the OTPF but is represented in ACOTE Standards. We envision that, if an integrative guide to curriculum development in occupational therapy (OT and OTA levels) were to be developed, the inclusion of Blueprint content may help to serve as a bridge between ACOTE Standards for education and the practice focus of the OTPF. Moreover, if the OTPF is to be revised soon, the timing may be good for developing a comprehensive guide to curriculum development, so that the potential for integration of the OTPF with other documents can be maximized for purposes of curriculum planning.

We recognize that if the Blueprint content is to be used in the future, whether as a separate document or as part of a comprehensive curriculum planning resource, it will need to be frequently

updated in order to keep pace with current and emerging knowledge. We also anticipate that development of a comprehensive curriculum planning resource will require active dissemination, including workshops and presentations for faculty. These activities will require financial and workforce resources from AOTA.

A final caveat is that if a comprehensive curriculum planning resource were to be developed, efforts should be made to address concerns about this document that were expressed by some faculty. We recommend that this resource tool should not be overly prescriptive; it should be adaptable to different curriculum structures and educational philosophies. It should be made clear that use of this curriculum planning tool would allow programs the flexibility to tailor their curricula in creative ways that build on local resources, unique assets, the particular educational philosophies of their programs, and the missions of their institutions.

Supporting Data

Compatibility of Blueprint with ACOTE Standards and Other Documents

We analyzed the compatibility of the Blueprint with ACOTE Standards by conducting a content analysis in which the current ACOTE Standards were examined for goodness of fit with Blueprint Topics, Concepts, Science, Skills, and Areas of Practice, within each set of Blueprint Factors (Person-Centered, Environment-Centered, Occupation-Centered, and Professional and Interpersonal). A matrix presenting results of this analysis is located in Appendix A (pp. 13-15). Results indicate that the Blueprint document is compatible with the ACOTE Standards, although the two documents are not linearly aligned due to differing structures and purposes. Both documents appear to follow Bloom's taxonomy (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains), with respect to the "skills" identified within the Blueprint and the descriptions of what "the student will be able to do" in the ACOTE Standards. Both documents support skill development as critically based on understanding and integrating knowledge related to underlying factors. They both also support the implementation of skills across variable contexts and areas of practice.

We noted that the Blueprint is also compatible with the language of the OTPF, which our data indicate is the second most influential document used in OT curricula development, after the

ACOTE Standards. However, the Blueprint includes areas not clearly addressed by the OTPF, namely, community-oriented practice, professional communication, and therapeutic use of self. The Blueprint also expands on terminology relevant to the ICF and the AOTA Centennial Vision, particularly the emerging areas of practice. The Blueprint identifies the various sciences fundamental to or developed within the occupational therapy profession, emphasizing the science-driven aspects of the profession. The Blueprint further emphasizes the use of critical thinking and analytical skills needed to develop OT practitioners who will enter diverse areas of practice.

The Blueprint omits information and terminology related to *intraprofessional* collaboration, i.e., in regard to the specific roles of OTs and OTAs. It also does not differentiate across different levels of entry-level OT education (e.g., doctoral, master's, and associate degrees). The Blueprint document acknowledges that it is not intended to "provide details about how or what to teach different levels of occupational therapy personnel," however, concepts and skills of collaboration and supervision among occupational therapists and occupational therapy assistants is critical to the document's intent to "prepare practitioners to address the future needs of society." Although the term *interprofessional* collaboration is lacking in the Blueprint, this document does include community collaboration and social interaction/community interaction as skills.

Survey Results: Faculty Perceptions of the Blueprint Document

The on-line survey of faculty perceptions of the Blueprint document was designed specifically to address the charges to this task group. The Education Operations Office of AOTA provided support with questionnaire formatting and entry using Zoomerang, as well as survey release using AOTA email lists. Special thanks are due to Valeta Njoroge and Neil Harvison for their assistance with survey administration.

The survey initially opened in mid-August 2012. Faculty received two follow-up reminders before the first run of the survey closed in mid-September 2012. At this point we had 405 respondents, and decided it would be optimal to attempt to recruit more participants. In an effort to increase the response pool, task group members prepared a brief PowerPoint talk on preliminary survey results that was presented by Thomas Fisher at the Program Directors meeting in October 2012. Subsequently we re-opened the survey for an additional 9 days, in which we accrued 343 more respondents. The survey closed in late October 2012.

Description of Respondents

Respondents were 748 faculty in entry-level OT and OTA programs who were asked to fill out the survey in reference to one entry-level program in which they teach. Approximately 1/3 of the respondents represented OTA programs. Most of the remaining respondents represented Master's level OT programs. Only 4% represented entry-level OTD programs.

A little over 1/3 of the respondents (N=262) were program directors of the entry-level program they represented. A little more than half (N=396) were full-time faculty members. The remaining 12% were part-time or adjunct faculty (N=90). Approximately 1/3 of the total group of respondents (N=246) stated that they were not aware of the existence of the Blueprint document prior to hearing about this survey.

Resources Rated as Helpful in Curriculum or Course Development

Respondents were asked to rate 14 documents, including the Blueprint document, for how helpful each one was in developing or revising the curriculum or courses. (See Appendix C, item 25, pp. 49-51.) Most respondents completed this section of the survey (N=578). Over 70% of the respondents to this section of the survey gave the highest rating ("very helpful") to two documents: ACOTE Standards (77%) and the Occupational Therapy Practice Framework (OTPF) (72%). In contrast, the majority of respondents (66%) gave the lowest ratings ("not used/not at all helpful" or "minimally helpful") to the Blueprint document. The 14 documents and their average ratings of helpfulness (with highest possible being 4.00) are listed below in descending order of helpfulness:

- ACOTE Standards (3.68)
- OTPF (3.64)
- NBCOT exam results (3.07)
- AOTA fieldwork evaluation form (3.01)
- Resources on models of practice or frames of reference (2.93)
- AOTA Centennial Vision (2.87)
- Other scholarly resources (2.81)
- ICF (2.66)
- *Model Curriculum for OT or OTA programs* (2.57)
- *Healthy People 2020* (2.35)
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC.gov) (2.24)

- *Blueprint for Entry-Level OT Education* (2.20)
- *AOTF Research Priorities for Occupational Therapy* document (2.17)
- Research priorities of government agencies (1.95)

Ratings of Overall Relevance and Application of the Blueprint Document

A discrepancy was apparent between respondent opinions about the potential value of the Blueprint document and their reports of the actual use of this document in curriculum development. Most respondents who were aware of the Blueprint document indicated that they saw a connection between the Blueprint document and preparing future OT practitioners (82% of 454 responses). Less certainty was expressed about the statement “I see the Blueprint for Entry Level Education as an essential document for entry level education that will move the occupational therapy profession toward its Centennial Vision,” with 50% agreeing and 37% not sure. As to whether the Blueprint document had actually influenced development of the entry-level curriculum at their institutions, a small proportion responded affirmatively with “quite a bit” or “extensively” (17% of 450 respondents), whereas 50% responded “not at all” or “minimally.”

Ratings of Extent of Blueprint Document Use in Particular Domains

Respondents who acknowledged that the Blueprint document was used at least minimally in curriculum development were asked to respond to additional questions about the extent to which Blueprint had been used in five main domains: (1) in curriculum design (i.e., the overall structure and sequencing of content across the curriculum); (2) to develop individual course descriptions, objectives, or content; (3) to create specific course learning activities and/or assessments; (4) to develop Level I fieldwork opportunities; and (5) to develop Level II fieldwork opportunities. (See Appendix C, items 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, on pp. 36-45) For each of the five domains of potential Blueprint usage (curriculum design, course design, learning activities, Level I FW, and Level II FW), ratings were grouped into three categories: low use (“not at all” or “minimally”), moderate use (“somewhat”), and high use (“quite a bit” or “extensively”). Results showed that, within each domain of possible Blueprint usage, the low use category contained the most responses. The strongest use of the Blueprint document was found for overall curriculum design, with 22% of the 364 respondents indicating high use, but even more respondents (37%) indicated low use of the Blueprint in curriculum design. For each of the other domains, the Blueprint was given low ratings by at least 50% of respondents.

The subsample of faculty familiar with the Blueprint was also asked to identify which of the specific Blueprint factors or related concerns were used in each domain of usage. The most commonly identified factors were occupation-centered and person-centered. However, relatively small numbers of respondents, ranging from only 72 to 193, answered these questions about specific Blueprint factors or applications. (See Appendix C, items 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, pp. 37-46.)

When asked about the extent to which their programs used the Blueprint to identify prerequisites, identify societal needs that the curriculum will address, and guide the professional development of students, faculty most frequently chose “minimally.” (Appendix C, item 23, pp. 47-48.) The predominant response was “not at all” for use of the Blueprint to identify competencies needed by new faculty, and to develop continuing education initiatives.

Faculty Comments on Specific Uses of the Blueprint Document

We solicited faculty comments about Blueprint use in five specific areas: curriculum design; individual course descriptions, objectives, or content; individual course learning activities or assessments; Level I fieldwork; and Level II fieldwork. This information was gathered in five open-ended questions which we qualitatively analyzed to identify major themes. Results are detailed in Appendix B (items 10, 13, 16, 19, and 22; pp. 16-22). Response rates were low, ranging from 33 to 111. Many of the comments indicated that the curriculum or courses were consistent with the Blueprint, or that the Blueprint generally stimulated discussion, rather than specifying how the Blueprint had been used to guide curriculum development or changes to the educational program. Comments that presented specific applications of the Blueprint described using it to:

- establish core concepts to be covered in courses,
- adopt Blueprint nomenclature and taxonomy in curriculum development and redesign (including names of courses, curricular themes, and curriculum threads),
- identify gaps and overlaps in content of courses, and plan courses accordingly
- develop student assessments based on Blueprint practice area topics,
- identify how non-traditional non-OT sites can be used to provide valuable fieldwork learning experiences,
- expand community-oriented content and learning experiences
- consider and select appropriate fieldwork sites, and
- collaborate with fieldwork educators to develop fieldwork learning activities that address all Blueprint factors.

Faculty Comments on How Curricula or Courses Evolved Due to Use of Blueprint

We also presented respondents with an open-ended question regarding how their curricula or courses had evolved due to use of the Blueprint. This question was designed to elicit information regarding outcomes of Blueprint use on curriculum development. Results of qualitative analysis are summarized in Appendix B (item 24, pp. 22-25). Only 17% of the total sample submitted responses to this question (N=125).

For those who reported that the Blueprint had made an impact, the primary ways that programs had evolved due to use of the Blueprint were:

- selection of content to include, reduce, or add across the curriculum,
- expansion of particular content across the curriculum,
- re-organization of the structure of the curriculum,
- re-organization of the process of curriculum planning and development,
- Selection of content for specific courses, and
- Reframing of learning objectives for specific courses.

The most often described impact was selection and expansion of content across the curriculum. Expansion was noted most often in regard to community and population-oriented knowledge and application skills. Also mentioned was addition of content related to political factors, spirituality, and application of OT to primary care.

However, it should also be noted that another group of respondents to this question stated that faculty had considered or tried to use the Blueprint, but this had resulted in little or no impact on curriculum development. Still others indicated that the Blueprint was used primarily to validate or support what the program already was doing, rather than to guide change. Alternatively, some stated that other documents, usually the ACOTE Standards, drove the evolution of the curriculum.

Faculty Recommendations to Maximize the Usefulness of the Blueprint Document

Respondents who were at least minimally familiar with the Blueprint document were asked to rate a list of strategies on whether they might enhance the usefulness of this document. (See Appendix C, item 26, pp. 51-52) For the 546 faculty who responded to this item, the strongest positive response (82%) advocated a strategy to “revise into a resource guide with concrete examples of applications

that align Blueprint content with ACOTE Standards, Model Curriculum, OTPF, and/or AOTA Level II FW Performance Evaluation.” Strategies to integrate the Blueprint with each of these documents, individually, were also endorsed by a majority of the respondents. On the other hand, fewer respondents advocated incorporation of Blueprint content into the NBCOT examination (39%).

Respondents were invited to suggest additional strategies that might be helpful in maximizing the usefulness of the Blueprint document (See Appendix B, item 27, pp. 26-28.) Among the 192 responses to this item, the most prevalent theme emphasized integration of the Blueprint with other guiding documents such as ACOTE Standards, OTPF, and the Model Curriculum. Many called for concrete examples of specifically how the Blueprint might be applied and integrated into curriculum and program development. Some respondents noted that the Blueprint document needs to be publicly discussed in order for educators to become aware or be reminded of its existence. Others called for data or workshops on how the Blueprint has supported programs, e.g., in examples of “best practice” situations. A number of respondents expressed concern that the Blueprint lacks clarity and needs more work to establish consensus on its content as well as how it should be used, whereas others suggested it could be used as a resource for programs, faculty, and conference planning. It should be noted, as well, that approximately 10% of the responses to this question indicated that the Blueprint is irrelevant, unnecessary, and that further development of it would be a waste of the profession’s resources.

Faculty Perceptions of the Drawbacks That Limit the Use of the Blueprint Document

A large number of faculty (N=546) responded to the final survey question, which was open ended and asked “What do you perceive as drawbacks that limit the use of the Blueprint document?” Results of qualitative analysis are presented in Appendix B (item 28, pp. 28-30). Responses were coded for themes, and then frequency of each theme was estimated. The top five major drawbacks, beginning with the most frequently noted, were:

- lack of integration with other documents, e.g., ACOTE Standards & OTPF;
- need to focus on ACOTE Standards & NBCOT exam, leaving no time for Blueprint;
- inability to operationalize content due to lack of clarity;
- lack of awareness among faculty; and
- fear that it will limit freedom to tailor programs to their unique settings.

Conclusion

Faculty survey data indicated that few OT or OTA programs use the Blueprint document, primarily due to lack of understanding how it can be used for curriculum development in concert with other relevant documents. ACOTE Standards and the Occupational Therapy Practice Framework are the two documents that currently dominate curriculum development. The lack of use of the Blueprint is not due to incompatibility between the Blueprint and ACOTE Standards. Although these two documents have different purposes and structures, they do not conflict with each other. In forced-choice as well as open-ended comments, faculty opinions suggested that development of resources and workshops for curriculum development would be helpful, to include specific examples that demonstrate how to use multiple documents in curriculum planning. Therefore, this task group recommends that instead of asking COE to bring formal action to the RA for adoption, AOTA should consider the development of an integrative resource for curriculum development in OT and OTA education that integrates aspects of the Blueprint with other key documents. We thank AOTA for giving us the opportunity to gather this information and make recommendations.

Diane Parham, Chair, University of New Mexico

Christine Berg, Washington University in St. Louis

Lea Brandt, Missouri Health Professions Consortium

Katherine Dimitropoulou, Long Island University

Maureen Nardella, North Shore Community College (Massachusetts)

Appendix A

Blueprint-ACOTE Standards Alignment

The following chart represents an attempt to understand the compatibility of the Blueprint document with the newly established ACOTE standards. Shaded areas represent ACOTE standards that refer to knowledge/competencies that are either underlying or evolving.

Blueprint: Person-Centered Factors	<i>Topics</i>	<i>Concepts</i>	<i>Science</i>	<i>Skills</i>	<i>Areas of Practice</i>
ACOTE 2013 Standards	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan C.1.0 - Fieldwork	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan C.1.0 - Fieldwork	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan C.1.0 - Fieldwork	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan C.1.0 - Fieldwork	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan C.1.0 - Fieldwork
Blueprint: Environment-Centered Factors	<i>Topics</i>	<i>Concepts</i>	<i>Science</i>	<i>Skills</i>	<i>Areas of Practice</i>
ACOTE 2013 Standards	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery

	B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 - Fieldwork	B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 - Fieldwork	B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 - Fieldwork	B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 - Fieldwork	B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 – Fieldwork
Blueprint: Occupation-Centered Factors	Topics	Concepts	Science	Skills	Areas of Practice
ACOTE 2013 Standards	B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 – Fieldwork	B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 – Fieldwork	B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 – Fieldwork	B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 – Fieldwork	B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management C.1.0 – Fieldwork
Blueprint: Professional and Interpersonal Factors	Topics	Concepts	Science	Skills	Areas of Practice
ACOTE 2013 Standards	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.4.0 – Screening, Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening,	B.1.0 – Foundational Content B.2.0 – Basic Tenets B.3.0 – OT Theoretical Perspectives B.4.0 – Screening,

	Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management B.8.0 – Scholarship B.9.0 Professional Ethics, Values, and responsibilities C.1.0 – Fieldwork	Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management B.8.0 – Scholarship B.9.0 Professional Ethics, Values, and responsibilities C.1.0 – Fieldwork	Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management B.8.0 – Scholarship B.9.0 Professional Ethics, Values, and responsibilities C.1.0 – Fieldwork	Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management B.8.0 – Scholarship B.9.0 Professional Ethics, Values, and responsibilities C.1.0 – Fieldwork	Evaluation and referral B.5.0 – Intervention Plan B.6.0 – Context of Service Delivery B.7.0 – Leadership and Management B.8.0 – Scholarship B.9.0 Professional Ethics, Values, and responsibilities C.1.0 – Fieldwork
--	---	---	---	---	---

Appendix B
Qualitative Analyses of Open-Ended Questions

Item 10: Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint factors have been used in curriculum design of your program. (N=111)

Major Themes:

1. All 4 factors are used in a variety of ways.

“The curriculum design of the program is organized around four core concepts or threads which are: Occupation, professional development, OT Process and EBP. The person-centered and Environment-centered factor are embedded in the core concept of occupation”

“Self awareness, interpersonal skills and professional behaviors have been infused into all courses. Professional behavioral standards have been a focus of emphasis over the past year.”

“Occupation-centered interventions are person-centered and influenced by context of the environment. Students learn professional core values and beliefs and develop interpersonal skills and behaviors”

2. Curriculum development

“As a new, entry-level OTA program, we used the Blueprint to help establish core concepts to be covered within each course, as well as determine course names”

“Our program has undergone a significant curriculum redesign and we used this document extensively as we considered everything from nomenclature for course names to structure of how/when to introduce concepts to our students“

“We use the blueprint to keep our course objectives in alignment to the design of each course, making sure that the students are receiving the education that the OT community deems necessary”

3. Faculty discussions

“Guiding & generating our basis for discussion for mission, goals, learning objectives, course sequence.”

“Facilitated discussion amongst faculty”

“During our self study for ACOTE accreditation and during our substantial curriculum revision, the matrix was used to check course content and sequencing of courses. It allowed us to see gaps and overlaps in courses.”

Item 13: Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint factors have been used to develop individual course descriptions, objectives, and/or content in your program. (N=66)

Major Themes:

1. In conjunction with other documents

“Blueprint factors used in conjunction with ACOTE standards to determine course descriptions, objectives and content, with OTPF at the core”.

“Courses are designed to focus on various areas of practice and environments as well as address the concepts and skills associated with the Blueprint Factors but more directly organized by the ACOTE Standards and OT Practice Framework.”

2. Factors are useful

“Each course has objectives and content that deal with each of the four factors”

“Our curriculum has been based on the following themes that are embedded throughout all the courses in the curriculum: client-centered, occupation-focused, and critical and ethical reasoning.”

“As previously mentioned 3 first year courses are titled: Domain: Personal Performance, Domain: Context and Environment, Domain: Human Occupation.”

3. Provides terminology/ Language

“I just worked with a team to revise a course formerly called "Task Analysis" to occupation-based activity. This allowed us to incorporate more occupation-centered and environment-centered concepts and skills into the course description, objectives and content.”

“Nomenclature; inclusion of key terms; cross checking of content”

“It has been used as a guide so as to assure that the language reflects concepts and principles as noted in the blueprint”

4. To revise or develop curriculum

“For each course we must identify one of our "threads" in our curriculum which in turn matches the blueprint factors.”

“All content across our curriculum uses, or will use, the blueprint factors. As a developing program we are currently working to complete all course content”

“The blueprint is being used to guide curriculum revision of all courses in our curriculum. For the courses that I am directly involved with, the Blueprint has been especially helpful with laying out content.”

Item 16: Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint factors have been used to create specific course learning activities and/or assessments in your program. (N=53)

Major Themes:

1. Community focus

“Our students all complete a community rotation. We actually have an OT on our faculty that was hired to supervise all of our level I and II students out on community rotations. She also treats at 3 community-based facilities in our area.”

“Occupational Profile assignment with clients in Level 1 FW [mental health]; Health education/health promotion service-learning project for elders in the community; faculty-led model of Level 1 FW supervision in Head Start program; Health Fair project for Head Start - children, parents and community; Leadership development plan assignment; and political advocacy assignment”

“Students in management explore many different community based options of delivery of OT services and then develop their own project/program in an area of service that is of interest to them”.

2. Building knowledge and skills

“Our OT Foundations course placed a lot of emphasis on the first exam about students’ knowledge of potential practice settings and the OT’s relationship with other professionals. The blueprints practice area topics was helpful for this part of the course”

“The blueprint provides a nice taxonomy of knowledge and skills that can be mixed and matched within individual courses.”

“Blueprint factors are used in designing student practice skills through lab activities. For instance, using PEO factors in evaluating a person’s occupational performance during an assessment.”

3. Assignments

“All of our course learning activities/assessments always either address the Blueprint Factors or we ask the students to relate them to the Blueprint Factors.”

“Specific projects/assignments are designed to reflect upon the blue print such as designing an activity analysis that follows the OTPF then relating back to the whole person”

“An assignment was created based on the Environmental Factors Topic and Concept of “Natural Environment” supports and impact on performance and participation: Students checked out a wheelchair and spent the weekend in it. During this time they encountered

many physical barriers that reduced participation in chosen occupations (household navigation, grocery shopping, going out to dinner etc). (they also learn about social and cultural environmental issues during this assignment).”

4. Integration of learning

“Student understanding of the science that underpins practice - I teach a work practice class where the students must apply their knowledge of anatomy and kinesiology along with occupation based activity to the field of work practice.”

“Analysis of computer workstation to promote concepts related to ergonomics in order to prevent or limit the frequency of repetitive strain injuries”

“Heavy emphasis on explaining how/why body responds to impairments (whether primary or secondary) and how the person adapts (or not) based on the context.”

Item 19: Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint Factors have been used to Develop Level 1 Fieldwork Opportunities in your program. (N=37)

Three Major Themes:

1. Designing Level 1 FW objectives, learning activities and evaluation forms to assess attainment of objectives

Examples:

- Factors embedded into course description and objectives
- Develop site-specific objectives on person, environment, occupation, professional behaviors and skills based on the Blueprint
- Blueprint useful in identifying how non-traditional non-OT sites can be used to provide valuable learning experiences
- FW objectives include inter/intraprofessional communication and teamwork, professionalism, use of creativity and resourcefulness in “context” of a given environment, and promotion of critical thinking related to “occupation-based” therapeutic activities
- Students provide reports on client-centered care, context and occupation-based treatments with their clients
- Occupation emphasized through documentation requirements – how is what you see occupationally relevant?
- Occupational profile is an assignment in mental health fieldwork
- Students complete fieldwork assignment that encompass all Blueprint factors (although based on curriculum devised before publication of the Blueprint)
- Professional behaviors are basis for all Level 1 FW
- Students develop their own objectives for each Level 1 FW experience to help them develop both their interpersonal and professional skills

- Students journal about FW experiences and how they relate to professional growth
- Opportunities based off curricular threads – community and grant-writing
- Service learning opportunities
- Items on Level 1 evaluation address all areas [Blueprint factors]

2. Selecting Sites to Use for Level 1 Fieldwork [as well as Supervisory Models]

Examples:

- Refer to Blueprint as we consider what sites would be appropriate
- Assess how program goals fit with sites
- Traditional and non-traditional sites (no OT Practitioner on site)
- Blueprint useful in identifying how non-traditional non-OT sites can be used to provide valuable learning experiences; useful in brainstorming ideas for potential sites
- Community-based settings (ex. Club Houses, etc.); and community based settings with faculty OTs as mentors
- Community-based FW 1 experiences are sought to exemplify the importance of environmental impact on occupational performance
- In process of moving placements assigned by medical diagnoses (or model) [e.g. physical disabilities or mental health] to occupation-centered, etc.
- Expose students to a variety of placements which challenge them to think about person, environment and occupation
- “occupation-based” as the criteria for selecting/using sites
- Used to develop infant mental health FW opportunity to relate to community resources and policy for foster care

3. Training /Educating Level 1 FW Site Supervisors/Educators

Examples:

- Share educational philosophy and student learning outcomes/FW objectives with FW sites
- Academic Fieldwork Coordinator and faculty host informational sessions/receptions for Level 1 FW educators
- Review goals of the program and how to apply them at site(s)
- Assist FW sites in developing site-specific goals/objectives that fit with program

Item 22: Please describe or provide examples of how Blueprint Factors have been used to Develop Level 2 Fieldwork Opportunities in your program. (N=33)

Three Major Themes:

1. Designing Level 2 FW objectives and learning opportunities/activities

Examples:

- The four factors are embedded into course descriptions and objectives – core concepts of curriculum design emphasized
- Blueprint factors guide site-specific objectives
- Attempt to provide FW experiences that incorporate the Blueprint factors
- Sites are provided suggested activities that reflect each area of Blueprint factors (also overlaps theme 3)
- Opportunities to use “person-centered” concepts
- AFWC and FW educators work to provide a balance of experiences that cover all factors (also overlaps theme 3)
- Blueprint factors used for professional development
- Developing and onsite FW II that is non-traditional practice by nature – Blueprint an excellent guide for expectations and goals
- All Level II FW opportunities are “occupation-based”; occupation-based experiences
- Look at items on AOTA Performance Evaluation; reflected in FWPE
- Assignments during FW correspond to the professional development and interpersonal factors listed in the Blueprint [students write about business soft skills learned in the program]
- Students complete assignments while on FW with the hopes that they will remain entrenched in the tenets of our program, though we still have many FW sites that are more entrenched in person factor/impairment-based intervention
- Increased emphasis in recognizing emotional and psychosocial issues

2. Selecting Sites to Use for Level 2 Fieldwork

Examples:

- Look for these [Blueprint factors] opportunities when selecting FW sites
- Choose level II sites that complement what we teach and the items that make our program unique from other programs
- Use Blueprint as part of new site orientation (also overlaps theme 3)
- Assess students’ involvement in settings that focus on the above [Blueprint factors] to make sure the fieldwork site is an appropriate match for our curriculum
- Matching students to the sites that will help them develop professional skills
- Sites that provide occupation-based experiences
- AFWC and FW educators work to provide a balance of experiences that cover all factors

3. Collaboration with and Training /Educating Level 2 FW Site Supervisors/Educators

Examples:

- Provide sites student learning outcomes, curriculum design, course syllabi, ACOTE Standards, and Blueprint
- Share success stories of how “premiere” FW sites educate OT students
- Yearly educational seminars for FW sites to keep informed on current practice trends and focus of education/practice
- Communicate with Level II FW sites about curricular approach [but not specifically develop sites based on blueprint]
- Use Blueprint as part of new site orientation
- Site provided suggested activities that reflect each area above [Blueprint Factors]
- FW Educators are educated in suggested activities that reflect each area above [Blueprint factors]
- FW supervisors are educated in specific assignments to enhance student learning

Item 24: Please describe in the space below specifically how your curriculum or courses have evolved due to use of the *Blueprint* document. (N=125)

Themes presented in the chart below emerged from the data and were used to code individual responses to this survey item. Responses from all but 12 of the respondents are represented below. Responses were omitted when they were not interpretable or when they indicated that the question was not applicable.

Ways that curricula or courses evolved due to Blueprint	Frequency of responses
<p>Blueprint had minimal or no impact</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“was referred to during curriculum review, but . . .not user friendly for extensive use”</p> <p>“In developing this new OTA program I consulted the Blueprint but actually used it minimally, other documents including the sample curriculum were much more helpful. The format of the blueprint was hard to follow and appeared repetitive.”</p> <p>“The Model Curriculum for an OT Program document was helpful for comparison, and looking at the minimal ACOTE standards, but the blueprint was of very little help in designing the curriculum or courses.”</p> <p>“we have minimally used the Blueprint and see little value in using it in the future.”</p>	<p>27</p>

<p>“This document has not been extensively used. It was reviewed by faculty. There was some confusion about how it could be implemented as part of the curriculum design. More detail about how it can be utilized with a sample curriculum under each of the sections would be helpful. If not a workshop regarding its use.”</p> <p>“The faculty as a whole feels that this document is too limiting and therefore voted not to use it as a measure of our curricular objectives.”</p>	
<p>Blueprint contributed to general curriculum planning</p> <p>Subthemes with examples:</p> <p><u>Decisions regarding content to include in curriculum:</u></p> <p>“The blueprint document has contributed considerations as to what content is included in certain areas, to make sure a broad perspective is being presented. It has also helped the program identify areas of strength and weakness.”</p> <p>“provides a guide and keeps our focus on what is most important for the students to know regarding our profession”</p> <p>“We chose to keep all the existing pre-requisites-though we were encouraged to reduce English requirements, and sociology course. We chose to combine the OTA courses instead. We used the Blueprint as a reason to support some of the decisions as well as the ACOTE standards.”</p> <p>“Focus has shifted from pathology to “occupation” and client, environment-centered discussion. Professional and interpersonal skills & behaviors have been given more weight in the teaching/learning process.”</p> <p>“Increase in spirituality topics within the curriculum courses, increase in looking at the political factors that are affecting the practice of OT today, and increase in teaching about OT serving populations.”</p> <p><u>Organization of curriculum content:</u></p> <p>“shaped the organization of the threads in the OT curriculum”</p> <p><u>Process of curriculum development:</u></p> <p>“we use this document for curriculum design, mission, and then specific goals, and then finally courses”</p> <p>“As a relatively new program we are realizing the importance of our alumni in further developing our curriculum and fieldwork opportunities.”</p>	<p>25</p>

<p><u>Expansion of practice areas covered:</u></p> <p>“we address the basic entry level skills required for success, balance that with the needs of the therapeutic community needs, and using these skills to affect change in the community at large by encouraging service.”</p> <p>“our curriculum responds to the occupational needs of individuals in primary care, and in high risk communities.”</p> <p>“The blueprint has helped us to explicitly develop course content directed at organizations and communities.”</p>	
<p>Blueprint validated or led to minor adjustments in the existing curriculum</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“the Blueprint has been helpful mostly/only in the area of curriculum design adjustments. We had a strong design due to working with a consultant and the Blueprint gave the faculty ideas revisions when we did our most recent update.”</p> <p>“Our curriculum was already developed when the Blueprint document came out. We have consulted it when making changes.”</p> <p>“Curriculum and course reviews have been ongoing prior to the Blueprint. The Blueprint may have validated our desired changes along with the evidence from fieldwork and networking with OT managers & clinicians.”</p> <p>“The blueprint was a good resource. It is comprehensive enough to be a reminder of what we need to include in the curriculum. The blueprint was a useful tool but I can’t say that it totally altered the curriculum. I think that the ACOTE standards were more influential while going through the process of designing the courses.”</p> <p>“If asked about our use of the Blueprint factors in our curriculum, my answer is “extensive”, but we do not refer to the Blueprint document. When the document was published it provided welcome support for our program tenets, curricular design, and educational philosophy. We wholeheartedly embrace the Blueprint document as a tool that should not only shape all OT programs, but OT practice as well.”</p> <p>“It reinforced what we were already doing. It helped tie curricular threads together.”</p>	<p>21</p>

<p>Other documents & resources influenced how curriculum/courses evolved</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“evolve based on ACOTE”</p> <p>“I am unsure of the amount of influence the document has had on our curricula. At this point, I would say we follow the ACOTE Standards as a ‘blueprint.’”</p> <p>“Blueprint is a reference list of items to remember to address. We are more concerned with the Standards.”</p> <p>“Referred to it during self-study for ACOTE. Should probably use it more, though there is much to refer to in meeting ACOTE standards and it is yet another document to refer to.”</p> <p>“We think the “Model Curriculum” is a better document to use for self-study and curriculum development. Don’t understand why “model curriculum” has not been more showcased at AOTA?”</p>	<p>21</p>
<p>Too soon to know -- plan to use or beginning to use Blueprint</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“Currently using this & other documents as we re-imagine our MOT program”</p> <p>“We have not used the Blueprint extensively. As we move to the new ACOTE standards and revise our curriculum, the program will use the Blueprint to guide revisions.”</p> <p>“It has not been used but will be used in the future.”</p>	<p>12</p>
<p>Blueprint influenced planning for specific courses</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“utilize it when planning & updating my courses”</p> <p>“some changes in wording of objectives”</p>	<p>7</p>

Item 27: What additional strategies do you think might be helpful to maximize the usefulness of the Blueprint document? Please list them below. (N=192)

Major Themes:

1. Specific strategies that will improve the use of the blueprint (See excerpts in the chart below).
2. The blueprint is not a useful tool (N=19). Excerpts:
 - “I do not feel it is a relevant document “
 - “Ultimately I think this document is unnecessary”
 - “I do not think the association should spend further time money and resources on this document. I cannot think of any useful strategies.”
3. Lack of familiarity to be able to suggest a strategy & “Not sure” (N=18)

Specific strategies that will improve the use of the blueprint	Frequency of responses with this theme
<p>Integration with other documents pertaining to curriculum development, such as the ACOTE standards, OTPF, NBCOT etc.</p> <p>Excerpts:</p> <p>“I think the Blueprint is a good document as it is. I believe that there are too many documents related to program content and this creates confusion. Integrating the blueprint concepts with ACOTE standards would be most effective since programs must meet the ACOTE standards.”</p> <p>“Any integration with the Framework and NBCOT testing would be very valuable to encourage the use of the Blueprint. Integrate into ACOTE standards and self-study reporting for accreditation.”</p> <p>“I was introduced to the blueprint at conference a few years ago. The definitions are helpful, but I am uncertain how this will dovetail along with ACOTE standards and the OTPF in a practical applied fashion. I would suggest that if this document is going to be useful that its purpose and utility is clearly identified in terms of how it is supplements/distinguishes itself from the ACOTE and OTPF. That remains unclear to me”</p>	32
<p>Provide specific application examples that reflect the potential use of the Blueprint especially in curriculum and program development</p> <p>Excerpts:</p>	24

<p>“It is a good document but also very vague. Concrete examples would be helpful”</p> <p>“provide examples as well as provide a way to demonstrate the synthesis of the information into a more systematic model”</p> <p>“ Curriculum Development workshops/conference for programs”</p>	
<p>Need to Disseminate and open up a discussion with educators and practitioners on the use of the Blueprint</p> <p>Excerpts:</p> <p>“Needs to be more widely publicized for input. Perhaps present as a bill for discussion at the RA”</p> <p>“Honestly, I knew this existed, but doing this survey was a wonderful reminder to me that this document exists and I should remember to pay attention to it. Another way to market this is at the Program Directors Meetings or SharePoint”</p> <p>“repeated presentation at state and AOTA conference”</p>	20
<p>Provide evidence of effectiveness of its use</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>“Additional data on how the Blueprint has supported programs with examples that can illustrate the usefulness of the Blueprint.”</p> <p>“Doing a pilot study if this has not already been done.”</p> <p>“Share how document is being used in "best practice" situations - workshops at program director meetings; faculty/educator workshops; FW educator workshops; etc.”</p>	10
<p>Clarity of purpose and further development</p> <p>“ explain its purpose”</p> <p>“I think instead of thinking of this tool as a finished product, more effort could be put into attempting to achieve consensus on its content. At this time there are limitations and the tool has not been developed to the point of which it can be a stand alone document. It would be beneficial to gather the thoughts of forward thinking educators and theorist inside and outside the profession to continue to develop this tool. Instead of asking questions such as - should content from the blueprint be included in other existing documents - such as the OT model curriculum, you may want to ask - how can we better include information from other sources into the blueprint”</p>	10

<p>“I am not really sure what the blueprint is for, despite reading it. Its purpose isn't clear to me”</p>	
<p>Use as a resource for programs and faculty</p> <p>Excerpts: “It might be helpful for developing programs.” “provide resources to instructors and program directors to enhance course delivery” “Reference the Blueprint in conference planning”</p>	<p>8</p>

Item 28: What do you perceive as drawbacks that limit the use of the Blueprint document?
 (N=546)

Theme	Frequency of responses with this theme
<p>Lack of congruence with other documents (Just one more tool, need an overarching inclusive framework)</p> <p>Example: “Since it is currently not integrated with ACOTE standards, OTPF, and NBCOT, it is perceived as another hoop to jump through.” “AOTA seems to be developing quite a variety of documents (as your survey list has supplied) and we need these to be more streamlined and assure that the content is also aligning with the NBCOT exam content and our vision.” “The language is not congruent with other documents widely used in OT programs by program directors such as the OTPF and the ACOTE Standards.”</p>	<p>96</p>
<p>Not related to ACOTE/NBCOT. No time to focus on document (less important than required documents) Irrelevant to ACOTE assessment measures, Not helpful for established programs</p> <p>Example: “It isn't what we are judged on. We spend a lot more time being focused on the ACOTE standards because our accreditation is required and NBCOT ideas because students want to pass the exam first time and this one major way students evaluate which school to apply to”</p>	<p>94</p>

<p>“Not sure this document has any utility. The ACOTE standards are far more influential and vital to educational design.”</p>	
<p>Inability to operationalize content (descriptive not directive, vague, too broad)</p> <p>Example: “The concepts in the Blueprint lack a context. The list of skills and areas of practice seem redundant within each category, indicating that perhaps the format is not useful. I am left wondering how to use this document and what it adds to curriculum development/revision. If the purpose of the document is to support education, then blending it with the OT Practice Framework does not make sense.”</p> <p>“Understanding what it is and how to use it. -Language - it seems to add another layer of complication to our already too complicated way of saying what we do. -Lack of clarity”</p>	83
<p>Lack of awareness</p> <p>Example: “Most people do not know the Blueprint exists. The people trying to get the Blueprint written had trouble making people understand why it was needed and this problem remains. The ACOTE standards are very comprehensive and this is what programs are measured by. Also there is a public process for input on the standards and they are updated on a specified timeline. The blueprint seemed to be pushed by powerful people in the OT education community and it is not a document that others have had input into”</p> <p>“I am unaware of the Blueprint and cannot comment on its usefulness because of my ignorance.”</p>	70
<p>Lead to over regulation, Too detailed, will lead to prescriptive programs</p> <p>Example: “a mechanism to decrease academic freedom.”</p> <p>“It does not address the uniqueness of every area in the country. A blueprint is a recipe for disaster. Unless you want to make the standards a prescriptive recipe for all programs to follow, then do not force this on program directors.”</p>	37
<p>No training available regarding its use.</p> <p>Example: “It is a structural tool. Could use more guidance in how to use the tool or</p>	36

<p>implement strategies from it.”</p> <p>“Lack of education on the document and its purpose”</p>	
<p>Lack of buy in from outside stakeholders (faculty, institutions, practitioners)</p> <p>Example: “Time to review it. [Teaching] loads and time allotted for faculty at the OTA level limits focus on these types of endeavors unless needed for a particular purpose.”</p> <p>“Getting this information to clinicians to support this in education.”</p> <p>“I see the Blueprint as a valuable tool to drive the future of OT education. There is some disagreement on our faculty and while I have worked to draw attention to the Blueprint, senior faculty are resistant to having a discussion on what this impact may be or even examining the document”</p>	24
<p>Disagree with Philosophical Point of View</p> <p>Example: “Our new curriculum themes include things like context and communities, therapeutic processes, human capacity for action as well as ethics, justice, and care (this is a work in progress but obviously didn't work with the blueprint document. I think we just don't frame the practice of OT in the same way.”</p> <p>“It omits the intellectual history and philosophical bases of the content it recommends. It is a content-driven vs. learning-driven document. Learning the intersections among the topics is to me, the most important issue in learning OT. The intersections are not visible or explicit enough in the document. Related to the above, practice that addresses the Centennial Vision requires assimilation across the topics of the Blueprint. The Blueprint runs the risk of keeping content areas in silos, accomplishing little to advance how students view and use knowledge in practice.”</p>	16
<p>Needs to be specific to level of degree (Separate OT/OTA documents, only applies to OTR)</p> <p>Example: “Blends together all levels of OT education (i.e., difficult to ascertain scope or specifics for OTA education).”</p>	5
<p>Only available in English</p> <p>Example: “Spanish Publication”</p>	2

Appendix B
Quantitative Analyses of On-Line Survey Ratings

1. What is your current position in the entry-level occupational therapy program that you will address in this survey?

	answered question	770
	skipped question	0
	Response	Response
	Percent	Count
Program director	34.0%	262
Full-time faculty member	51.4%	396
Part-time or adjunct faculty member	11.7%	90
I am not a faculty member or program director in an entry-level OT program	2.9%	22

2. This survey will reflect which one of the following programs?

	answered question	728
--	--------------------------	------------

2. This survey will reflect which one of the following programs?

skipped question			42
	Response Percent	Response Count	
Associate degree or certificate in occupational therapy (OTA)	34.2%	249	
Master's degree in occupational therapy (OT)	62.0%	451	
Doctor of Occupational Therapy (OT)	3.8%	28	

3. What is your current position in the entry-level occupational therapy program that you will address in this survey?

answered question			728
skipped question			42
	Response Percent	Response Count	
Program director	34.8%	253	

3. What is your current position in the entry-level occupational therapy program that you will address in this survey?

Full-time faculty member	53.0%	386
Part-time or adjunct faculty member	11.7%	85
I am not a faculty member or program director in an entry-level OT program	0.5%	4

4. Before receiving or hearing of this survey, were you already aware of the existence of the *Blueprint for Entry Level Education* developed by AOTA?

	answered question	721
	skipped question	49
	Response	Response
	Percent	Count
Yes	65.9%	475
No	34.1%	246

5. I see the connection between the *Blueprint for Entry Level Education* and preparing future occupational therapy practitioners.

5. I see the connection between the *Blueprint for Entry Level Education* and preparing future occupational therapy practitioners.

		answered question	454
		skipped question	316
		Response	Response
		Percent	Count
Agree		82.2%	373
Disagree		5.3%	24
Not Sure		12.6%	57

6. I see the *Blueprint for Entry Level Education* as an essential document for entry level education that will move the occupational therapy profession toward its Centennial Vision.

		answered question	454
		skipped question	316

6. I see the *Blueprint for Entry Level Education* as an essential document for entry level education that will move the occupational therapy profession toward its Centennial Vision.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Agree	50.2%	228
Disagree	12.8%	58
Not Sure	37.0%	168

7. In your experience, has the *Blueprint for Entry Level Education* influenced development of your entry-level curriculum to any extent?

	answered question	450
	skipped question	320
	Response Percent	Response Count
Not at all	18.4%	83
Minimally	31.3%	141
Somewhat	33.3%	150

7. In your experience, has the *Blueprint for Entry Level Education* influenced development of your entry-level curriculum to any extent?

Quite a bit	14.0%	63
Extensively	2.9%	13

8. To what extent does your program use the *Blueprint Factors* to develop the **curriculum design** (i.e., the overall structure and sequencing of content across the curriculum)?

	answered question	364
	skipped question	406
	Response Percent	Response Count
Not at all	9.3%	34
Minimally	27.2%	99
Somewhat	35.2%	128
Quite a bit	17.6%	64
Extensively	4.1%	15
I don't know	6.6%	24

9. Which of the following Blueprint *Factors* has your program used in **curriculum design** (i.e., the overall structure and sequencing of content across the curriculum)? Check all that apply

	answered question	193
	skipped question	577
	Response Percent	Response Count
Person-centered	66.8%	129
Environment-centered	52.3%	101
Occupation-centered	86.5%	167
Professional and interpersonal	58.0%	112
Not sure	9.3%	18

10. Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint *Factors* have been used in **curriculum design** of your program.

	answered question	111
--	-------------------	-----

10. Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint *Factors* have been used in **curriculum design** of your program.

skipped question		659
		Response
		Count
Show replies		111

11. To what extent does your program use the Blueprint *Factors* to **develop individual course descriptions, objectives, and/or content?**

answered question		344	
skipped question		426	
	Response	Response	
	Percent	Count	
Not at all	17.4%	60	
Minimally	32.6%	112	
Somewhat	28.8%	99	

11. To what extent does your program use the Blueprint *Factors* to **develop individual course descriptions, objectives, and/or content?**

Quite a bit	11.3%	39
Extensively	2.6%	9
I don't know	7.3%	25

12. Which of the following Blueprint *Factors* has your program used to **develop individual course descriptions, objectives, and/or content?** Check all that apply.

	answered question	137
	skipped question	633
	Response	Response
	Percent	Count
Person-centered	76.6%	105
Environment-centered	62.8%	86
Occupation-centered	89.8%	123
Professional and interpersonal	65.0%	89
Not sure	5.8%	8

13. Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint *Factors* have been used to **develop individual course descriptions, objectives, and/or content** in your program.

	answered question	66
	skipped question	704
	Response	
	Count	
	Show replies	66

14. To what extent does your program use the Blueprint to **create specific course learning activities and/or assessments?**

	answered question	333
	skipped question	437
	Response	Response
	Percent	Count
Not at all	22.2%	74
Minimally	33.3%	111

14. To what extent does your program use the Blueprint to **create specific course learning activities and/or assessments**?

Somewhat	27.0%	90
Quite a bit	7.2%	24
Extensively	1.8%	6
I don't know	8.4%	28

15. For which of the following concerns is the Blueprint useful in **creating specific course learning activities and/or assessments**? Check all that apply.

	answered question	115
	skipped question	655
	Response	Response
	Percent	Count
Student knowledge of key topics and concepts	72.2%	83
Student understanding of the science that underpins practice	58.3%	67
Student development of practice skills	73.0%	84

15. For which of the following concerns is the Blueprint useful in **creating specific course learning activities and/or assessments**? Check all that apply.

Student familiarity with areas of practice in occupational therapy	68.7%	79
Not sure	8.7%	10

16. Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint *Factors* have been used to **create specific course learning activities and/or assessments** in your program.

	answered question	53
	skipped question	717
	Response	
	Count	
	Show replies	53

17. To what extent does your program use Blueprint *Factors* to **develop Level I fieldwork opportunities**?

	answered question	324
--	--------------------------	------------

17. To what extent does your program use Blueprint *Factors* to **develop Level I fieldwork opportunities**?

		skipped question	446
		Response	Response
		Percent	Count
Not at all		22.8%	74
Minimally		32.1%	104
Somewhat		17.6%	57
Quite a bit		6.5%	21
Extensively		2.2%	7
I don't know		18.8%	61

18. Which of the following Blueprint *Factors* has your program used to **develop Level I fieldwork opportunities**? Check all that apply.

		answered question	83
		skipped question	687

18. Which of the following Blueprint *Factors* has your program used to **develop Level I fieldwork opportunities**? Check all that apply.

	Response Percent	Response Count
Person-centered	66.3%	55
Environment-centered	63.9%	53
Occupation-centered	75.9%	63
Professional and interpersonal	67.5%	56
Not sure	7.2%	6

19. Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint *Factors* have been used to **develop Level I fieldwork opportunities** in your program.

answered question	37
skipped question	733
	Response
	Count
Show replies	37

20. To what extent does your program use Blueprint *Factors* to **develop Level II fieldwork opportunities**?

		answered question	322
		skipped question	448
		Response Percent	Response Count
Not at all		24.2%	78
Minimally		31.7%	102
Somewhat		14.6%	47
Quite a bit		7.5%	24
Extensively		1.6%	5
I don't know		20.5%	66

21. Which of the following Blueprint *Factors* has your program used to **develop Level II fieldwork opportunities**? Check all that apply.

		answered question	72
--	--	--------------------------	-----------

21. Which of the following Blueprint *Factors* has your program used to **develop Level II fieldwork opportunities**? Check all that apply.

skipped question				698
		Response		Response
		Percent		Count
Person-centered		79.2%		57
Environment-centered		69.4%		50
Occupation-centered		83.3%		60
Professional and interpersonal		77.8%		56
Not sure		6.9%		5

22. Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint *Factors* have been used to **develop Level II fieldwork opportunities** in your program.

	answered question	33
	skipped question	737

22. Please describe or provide an example of how Blueprint *Factors* have been used to **develop Level II fieldwork opportunities** in your program.

Response

Count

[Show replies](#)

33

23. To what extent does your program use the *Blueprint* to:

answered 0

skipped 0

	Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Quite a bit	Extensively	Don't Know	Rating Average
Identify appropriate pre-requisites, including courses or requirements outside the OT program.	22.4% (67)	34.1% (102)	22.1% (66)	9.4% (28)	2.0% (6)	10.0% (30)	
Identify societal needs that the	13.4% (40)	33.4% (100)	28.4% (85)	12.4% (37)	3.7% (11)	8.7% (26)	

23. To what extent does your program use the *Blueprint* to:

curriculum will address.

Guide the professional development of students.

14.7% (44) **29.1% (87)** 23.4% (70) 20.4% (61) 5.7% (17) 6.7% (20)

Identify competencies needed when recruiting new faculty.

28.8% (86) 27.1% (81) 17.4% (52) 9.0% (27) 3.3% (10) 14.4% (43)

Develop continuing education initiatives for alumni and community partners.

32.8% (98) 24.7% (74) 16.4% (49) 10.7% (32) 2.0% (6) 13.4% (40)

24. Please describe in the space below specifically how your curriculum or courses have evolved due to use of the *Blueprint* document.

answered question **125**

skipped question **645**

24. Please describe in the space below specifically how your curriculum or courses have evolved due to use of the *Blueprint* document.

	Response
	Count
Show replies	125

25. For each statement below, indicate the extent to which you find the following document helpful in the development or revision of the curriculum and individual courses.

					answered question	578
					skipped question	192
	Not used					
	or not at	Minimally	Somewhat	Very	Rating	Response
	all	helpful	helpful	helpful	Average	Count
	helpful					
<i>International Classification of Functioning (ICF)</i>	15.4% (89)	26.3% (152)	34.8% (201)	23.5% (136)	2.66	578
<i>Occupational Therapy</i>	2.2%	3.3% (19)	22.7%	71.8%	3.64	578

25. For each statement below, indicate the extent to which you find the following document helpful in the development or revision of the curriculum and individual courses.

<i>Practice Framework</i> (OTPF)	(13)		(131)	(415)		
ACOTE Standards	1.9% (11)	5.0% (29)	15.9% (92)	77.2% (446)	3.68	578
Model Curriculum for OT or OTA Programs (AOTA document)	19.0% (110)	25.4% (147)	34.8% (201)	20.8% (120)	2.57	578
Blueprint for Entry Level Education (AOTA document)	29.1% (168)	33.0% (191)	27.2% (157)	10.7% (62)	2.20	578
NBCOT exam results	6.9% (40)	15.4% (89)	41.3% (239)	36.3% (210)	3.07	578
AOTA Centennial Vision	7.4% (43)	24.2% (140)	42.2% (244)	26.1% (151)	2.87	578
Healthy People 2020	24.7% (143)	27.5% (159)	35.3% (204)	12.5% (72)	2.35	578
Centers for Disease Control & Prevention (CDC.gov)	25.1% (145)	34.1% (197)	32.2% (186)	8.7% (50)	2.24	578
AOTA fieldwork evaluation form	5.7% (33)	20.9% (121)	40.5% (234)	32.9% (190)	3.01	578
Research Priorities for Occupational Therapy(AOTF document)	28.4% (164)	34.9% (202)	28.2% (163)	8.5% (49)	2.17	578
Research priorities of	36.9%	38.2%	18.2%	6.7%	1.95	578

25. For each statement below, indicate the extent to which you find the following document helpful in the development or revision of the curriculum and individual courses.

government agencies	(213)	(221)	(105)	(39)		
Resources on models of practice or frames of reference	7.6% (44)	22.0% (127)	39.8% (230)	30.6% (177)	2.93	578
Other scholarly resources	9.9% (57)	22.8% (132)	43.6% (252)	23.7% (137)	2.81	578

26. Do you recommend the following strategies to maximize the usefulness of the *Blueprint* document?

					answered question	546
					skipped question	224
	Yes, this would help	No, this would not be helpful	Not sure	Rating Average	Response Count	
Integrate into ACOTE standards	69.8% (381)	10.4% (57)	19.8% (108)	1.50	546	
Integrate with the Model Curriculum	59.2% (323)	10.1% (55)	30.8% (168)	1.72	546	

26. Do you recommend the following strategies to maximize the usefulness of the *Blueprint* document?

Integrate with the <i>Occupational Therapy Practice Framework: Domain and Process</i>	72.3% (395)	11.0% (60)	16.7% (91)	1.44	546
Integrate with the AOTA Level II Fieldwork Performance Evaluation tool	59.9% (327)	13.4% (73)	26.7% (146)	1.67	546
Represent <i>Blueprint</i> content on the NBCOT exam	38.6% (211)	24.7% (135)	36.6% (200)	1.98	546
Revise into a resource guide with concrete examples of applications that align <i>Blueprint</i> content with ACOTE Standards, Model Curriculum, OTPF, and/or AOTA Level II FW Performance Evaluation	82.2% (449)	5.7% (31)	12.1% (66)	1.30	546

27. What additional strategies do you think might be helpful to maximize the usefulness of the *Blueprint* document. Please list them below.

answered question **192**

skipped question **578**

27. What additional strategies do you think might be helpful to maximize the usefulness of the *Blueprint* document. Please list them below.

	Response Count
Show replies	192

28. What do you perceive as drawbacks that limit the use of the *Blueprint* document?

answered question	546
skipped question	224