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Background
• Occupational therapy (OT) fieldwork consortium
• Organization of geographically close schools facing similar issues and challenges
• Allows collaboration between Academic Fieldwork Coordinators (AFCs) to secure fieldwork placements
• Limits competition between OT programs in an area

• Little is known about the fieldwork placement process and effective practice strategies of AFCs, including fieldwork consortium membership.

Objectives
• To gather information about OT programs and the Level II fieldwork placement process from AFCs in the US.
• To identify and analyze a set of variables to determine significant differences between OT programs that belong to a consortium versus those that do not.
• To determine the role of competition in forming or joining a fieldwork consortium.

Measures
• OT AFC Level II Matching Process Survey: developed by Roberts, Simon & Koski (unpublished data)
  • 31 open-ended and close-ended questions
• Scope of Survey
  • Demographics of program: location, degree level, program structure
  • Process of fieldwork application and placement
  • AFC experience and clinical reasoning during selection
  • Competition level

Methods
• Survey distributed via AOTA to 308 programs nationwide (one survey per program)
  • 126 surveys completed and returned (41% return rate)
  • Respondents: 81 consortium; 43 non-consortium
• ANOVA tests used to compare consortium and non-consortium populations.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFC Academia Years</td>
<td>f(1,122)=4.290, p= .013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFC Practice Years</td>
<td>f(1,122)=8.049, p= .015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Nearby Schools</td>
<td>f(1,122)=13.689, p= .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Equivalents</td>
<td>f(1,122)=4.744, p= .036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition Level</td>
<td>f(1,122)=.595, p= .442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Setting</td>
<td>f(1,122)=1.207, p=.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>f(1,122)=2.468, p=.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Input</td>
<td>f(1,121)=2.004, p=.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Variables

Future Research
• Analyze remaining variables not included in the current study and compare findings.
• Evaluate the motivating factors for OT programs to join a fieldwork consortium and determine advantages and disadvantages of consortium membership.
• Establish if benefits of uniformity in fieldwork placement process and fieldwork education exist.

Conclusion
• AFC experience in Practice and Academia, Number of Full Time Equivalents: positive correlation with fieldwork consortium membership.
• Findings suggest that AFCs who have worked in the OT field longer have developed connections with other schools and programs through collaboration with colleagues in the area.
• Nearby Schools: positive correlation with fieldwork consortium membership.
• No difference in perceived level of competition between the two populations despite having significantly more schools nearby for programs involved in a consortium.
• All other variables did not have a significant correlation with fieldwork consortium membership.
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