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ABSTRACT
Fieldwork education is an important element in training future occupational therapy practitioners. It fosters the application of didactic knowledge to practice and the transition from student to occupational therapist or occupational therapy assistant. More than 25% of occupational therapists work in schools and early intervention, and more than 20% of occupational therapy assistants work in school-based practice (American Occupational Therapy Association [AOTA], 2010a), so it is critical that Level I and Level II fieldwork experiences include these settings to prepare entry-level occupational therapy practitioners to meet the needs of clients.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading this article, you should be able to:
1. Identify the important elements of Level I and Level II fieldwork experiences.
2. Compare the different requirements between Level I and Level II fieldwork.
3. Select appropriate documents to develop learning objectives for both Level I and Level II fieldwork.
4. Identify how reflective exercises can be incorporated into Level I and Level II fieldwork to foster clinical reasoning.

INTRODUCTION
Fieldwork experiences are designed to foster the transition from occupational therapy student to occupational therapy practitioner (American Occupational Therapy Association [AOTA], 2009a) and can vary substantially in the setting and occupational needs of the clients served. They are categorized as either Level I or Level II fieldwork (Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education [ACOTE®], 2007a, 2007b, 2007c) and are required by accredited occupational therapy programs, at both the technical and graduate level within the United States.

PURPOSE OF FIELDWORK EXPERIENCES
Level I fieldwork occurs while students are enrolled in academic programs. Frequently, a specific course in the academic program helps a student interpret observations made and experiences at a fieldwork site. Level I fieldwork provides students with a view of occupational therapy practice while still completing academic coursework (ACOTE, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Examples of activities students may be expected to perform during Level I fieldwork include completing observational forms, documenting client responses, writing progress notes with guidance, and helping to provide occupational therapy services. Academic programs decide on the number of hours students must complete and the students’ specific responsibilities. The desired outcome of Level I fieldwork is to provide students with the opportunity to translate knowledge into practice and to understand the occupational needs of clients.

Level II fieldwork is designed for occupational therapy students to develop the entry-level competence needed at a specific setting (ACOTE, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). The fieldwork often occurs near or at the end of the academic coursework, or at least following sufficient academic preparation for students to meet Level II fieldwork demands. The goal of these experiences is for students, whether at the technical or graduate level, to demonstrate entry-level generalist skills. Occupational therapy students at the graduate level would be expected to assume the roles and responsibilities of entry-level clinicians, whereas occupational therapy assistant students would be expected to demonstrate entry-level skills commensurate with that level of practice. This goal requires Level II fieldwork sites to clearly articulate expectations for entry-level practice and develop systematic goals that students must achieve during the fieldwork to successfully reach that outcome (Schultz-Krohn & Pendleton, 2002). Level II fieldwork sites should be carefully selected to ensure students have the necessary supervision and support to meet the desired outcomes (Soderlund, 2006).

Minimum duration requirements of Level II fieldwork are stipulated by ACOTE (2007a, 2007b, 2007c), and students should complete these Level II fieldwork experiences at two different sites or with two different types of client populations or practice settings. The Level II fieldwork minimum requirements for occupational therapy assistants is the equivalent of 16 weeks of full-time work, typically divided between two sites to provide a diverse experience for the student. For occupational therapy graduate students, the equivalent of 24 weeks of full-time work is needed to complete Level II fieldwork requirements, typically divided between two different sites. As an example, at one large urban hospital, an occupational therapy student was assigned for 13 weeks with...
the outpatient rehabilitation services and then for another 12 weeks with the inpatient mental health services. Academic programs may have additional requirements that must be met to complete Level II fieldwork, but ACOTE provides the minimum requirements in terms of equivalent full-time work. Whether at the technical or graduate level, students must demonstrate entry-level competence as occupational therapy practitioners to successfully pass this requirement.

SUPERVISORY REQUIREMENTS
Students completing Level I fieldwork, whether at the technical or graduate level, can be supervised by a wide variety of professionals and practitioners (ACOTE, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Although an academic program may stipulate that Level I fieldwork students be supervised by occupational therapy practitioners, ACOTE indicates that other professionals, including teachers, psychologists, social workers, and physical therapists, can also provide supervision. Because this fieldwork is closely linked to academic coursework, students may be placed in sites where no current occupational therapy services are provided or where such services could be expanded. Academic programs must, however, provide clear expectations of the student experience. Level I fieldwork is focused on students making the connection between knowledge and practice, but students are not expected to achieve entry-level competence by the completion of Level I fieldwork.

Clinical Example: “Share a Snack”
An example of shared supervision for Level I fieldwork students can be seen in an integrated preschool program where the occupational therapist and the occupational therapy assistant, who have full schedules, would like to start a “Share a Snack” social interaction group for children with autism spectrum disorders (ASDs) and children who are neurotypical. The occupational therapy practitioners at the program understand the importance of helping children who have ASDs overcome aversion to various foods (Cermak, Curtin, & Bandini, 2010; Chatooor, 2009) and providing a structured opportunity for children who have ASDs to interact with children who are neurotypical. Using peers who are neurotypical to model exploration of and possibly try new foods can help children who have ASDs be more comfortable trying them. Meeting for a snack as opposed to a more formal, elaborate meal can provide initial exposure to different foods under less intimidating conditions. However, the occupational therapy practitioners, although they understood the need to provide psychosocial support for children with special needs (McDuff, Schultz, Andersson, & Pemberton, 2009), had limited time to provide this service consistently. Thus, when the occupational therapist was approached by the local university to offer Level I fieldwork for graduate occupational therapy students currently enrolled in a course addressing pediatric practice settings, with a specific emphasis on school-based practice, the therapist saw an opportunity: The need for additional support services for children who have ASDs and the need for graduate students to gain Level I fieldwork experience in the schools could be combined creatively.

The occupational therapist approached the preschool teacher and suggested that occupational therapy graduate students from the local university come twice a week during the snack time to help encourage all the children to identify the sensory attributes of new snacks, such as the color, texture, and smell, although the students would not require any child to eat the snack. Typically, a classroom aide would sit with the children during snack time. The occupational therapy practitioners developed a program to identify the children’s preferred snacks and, based on this information, select new snacks with attributes similar to those of the preferred snacks. The occupational therapy assistant supervised the Share a Snack group once a week, and the teacher agreed to supervise the occupational therapy graduate students during the other Share a Snack time. The occupational therapist did not participate in the Share a Snack time but regularly met with both the occupational therapy assistant and the teacher. The occupational therapy graduate students completing the Level I fieldwork met with both the occupational therapy assistant and the course instructor in the academic program to understand the types of foods that could be offered as a novel snack and how to discuss the sensory attributes of the snacks offered.

The students completing the Level I fieldwork were supervised by the occupational therapy assistant, with additional supervision from the preschool teacher when the occupational therapy assistant was not present. This experience was closely linked to academic coursework to help the graduate students interpret and document the responses of the children participating in the Share a Snack group. The occupational therapy graduate students met with the occupational therapy assistant to plan the introduction and presentation of new foods. This creative Level I fieldwork experience gave the graduate students a unique view of the sensory challenges seen in children who have ASDs and allowed those children an opportunity to explore the sensory attributes of foods without the demand to eat them.

The academic program and professionals at the site collaborated to supervise the students completing the Level I fieldwork. The expectation was not that the graduate occupational therapy students would develop competent entry-level skills, but that they would apply coursework to practice by implementing a structured program to support the occupational needs of children with ASDs.

Fieldwork Supervision
The qualifications to serve as a fieldwork supervisor differ depending on the type of fieldwork experience and the academic program’s requirements (ACOTE, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Students completing Level I fieldwork can be super-
vised by a variety of professionals and/or staff at the site, provided they are knowledgeable about the profession and able to provide appropriate supervision and support (ACOTE, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Academic programs work directly with sites and provide additional supervision of students through discussions and guidance. Often, occupational therapy practitioners participate in supervising Level I fieldwork students prior to supervising Level II fieldwork students, but ACOTE does not require this. The support provided by academic programs helps occupational therapy practitioners develop the skills needed to supervise Level II fieldwork students.

For occupational therapy students, either at the technical or graduate level, ACOTE provides specific requirements for Level II fieldwork site supervisors (ACOTE, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Occupational therapy graduate students must be supervised by occupational therapists with at least 1 year of experience. Occupational therapy assistant students may be supervised by occupational therapists or occupational therapy assistants, who must also have at least 1 year of clinical experience. ACOTE provides the minimum standards, and additional requirements may be stipulated by either the participating sites or academic programs. For occupational therapy practitioners to supervise Level II fieldwork students, there is an additional expectation that the supervisors understand the role of an entry-level practitioner at the site. There should be clear objectives sequenced throughout the Level II fieldwork to help students achieve that outcome.

CREATING FIELDWORK OBJECTIVES

The fieldwork experience supports the student’s transition to practitioner (Costa, 2004). This transition requires clearly articulated goals and objectives (Schultz-Krohn & Pendleton, 2002).

Fieldwork Level I Objectives

The Level I fieldwork experience is closely linked to the academic program and, therefore, student objectives should be developed by academic programs in collaboration with fieldwork sites (ACOTE, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c; Costa, 2004). Academic programs may have several Level I fieldwork experiences with progressively more challenging objectives as students advance through the programs. For example, the first semester of courses in an occupational therapy program may include Level I fieldwork that allows students to observe how occupational therapy practitioners interact in various practice settings. Using data from AOTAs 2010 Occupational Therapy Compensation and Workforce Study (AOTA, 2010a), which found that more than 25% of occupational therapists work in school-based practice and early intervention and more than 21% of occupational therapy assistants work in schools, one academic program designed a Level I fieldwork experience in which students observed occupational therapy practitioners in various practice settings, including school-based and early intervention, and were then required to describe the focus of service using the Occupational Therapy Practice Framework: Domain and Process, 2nd Edition (Framework-II; AOTA, 2008). In this example, students were expected to understand the Framework-II and observe how services were delivered in various settings. This Level I fieldwork experience included having students observe practitioners for several hours in each of the following settings: a preschool, an inclusion classroom, a school in which services were provided as a Response to Intervention (RTI; Clark & Polichino, 2010), and a community-based life-skills program for teenagers. Students were expected to understand how the occupational therapy services were provided to meet not only the clients’ needs but also the environmental expectations. The following examples of objectives developed by the academic program reflect these expectations:

1. The student will report the type of services provided by the occupational therapy practitioner at the various sites using terminology from the Framework-II.
2. The student will describe the focus of intervention at each site using terminology from the Framework-II.
3. The student will identify the intended outcome for clients served at the various sites using terminology from the Framework-II.

As the students advance through this particular academic program, a second Level I fieldwork experience is provided concurrent with a course on enhancing pediatric occupational performance, particularly social participation for children with various disabling conditions. Several Level I fieldwork sites provide the opportunity for occupational therapy students to apply the classroom knowledge of supporting social participation for children with disabling conditions to practice. Indeed, there is a growing demand for occupational therapy practitioners to meet this need in the public schools (Bazyk, 2010; McDuff et al., 2009; Olson, 2009). At one Level I fieldwork site, students working with an occupational therapist at a public school helped facilitate a social skills group to foster appropriate playground interactions between children with ASDs and children who are neurotypical. Again, this Level I fieldwork is not designed for students to demonstrate entry-level competence; rather, students are expected to apply their academic knowledge within a supervised clinical setting.

Level I fieldwork objectives focus on students’ ability to connect didactic experiences with clinical experiences (Costa, 2004). These objectives are often designed to help students develop observational skills and foundational professional behaviors. If a site offers Level I fieldwork for students at both the technical and graduate levels, the objectives provided by the academic programs should reflect the difference in practice expectations. The following are examples of objectives developed by an academic program for this type of Level I fieldwork experience for occupational therapy students.
1. The student will identify the environmental supports and challenges related to social participation faced by children with disabling conditions.

2. The student will demonstrate appropriate interactions with children and professionals.

3. The student will report effective and ineffective strategies used to foster social participation for children with disabling conditions during playground time.

Level II Fieldwork Objectives
Level II fieldwork is designed for the occupational therapy student to demonstrate entry-level practice skills upon completing the experience. Therefore, objectives should reflect the expectations of entry-level practitioners at that site (Schultz-Krohn & Pendleton, 2002). From a perspective of school-based or early intervention programs, it is imperative to clearly identify the expectations of entry-level practitioners. If a site typically does not hire entry-level practitioners, communication between the academic fieldwork coordinator and the site supervisor is essential to create appropriate Level II fieldwork objectives.

CLINICAL EXAMPLE
All Kids Can Learn, a community-based early intervention program, did not typically hire entry-level occupational therapy practitioners due to the medical complexity and behavioral issues of many of the infants and toddlers served. But Jean, an occupational therapist with more than 11 years of experience who has been employed by this program for the past 5 years, wanted to offer Level II fieldwork to a graduate occupational therapy student. Jean had previously provided Level I fieldwork experiences through All Kids Can Learn for occupational therapy graduate students from the local university, and these students consistently expressed interest in working in early intervention. The Level I fieldwork focused on graduate students understanding the importance of providing services for infants and young children using naturalistic learning opportunities (Stewart, 2009).

Jean discussed the possibility of offering Level II fieldwork with her supervisor, explaining that training graduate occupational therapy students would not only enhance Jean’s professional development but would also create stronger connections between All Kids Can Learn and the local university. Those ties would include access to literature that could improve the program’s evidence-based practice (Clark & Schultz-Krohn, 2011; Lopez, Varner, Cowan, Samuel, & Shepherd, 2008). Additionally, a typical Level II fieldwork objective includes having students complete projects to enhance or expand services at the site, and this additional support would be beneficial in providing best practice services to the program’s families, Jean noted. Jean’s supervisor agreed to offer Level II fieldwork, and the contractual agreements between their community-based early intervention program and the local university were completed. Jean was now faced with determining what expectations would be appropriate for entry-level occupational therapists within this program.

To begin this process, Jean and the university’s fieldwork coordinator reviewed the job essentials for an occupational therapist and compared them to her current responsibilities. Jean reviewed the specific site expectations and ACOTE’s definition of entry-level practice and competency to help develop the Level II fieldwork experience (ACOTE, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c). Jean also consulted with the academic program for support and assistance in developing appropriate outcomes for this Level II fieldwork experience. She then created weekly expectations to be met by the students to achieve competence in entry-level practice.

Level II fieldwork objectives need to be sequenced with systematic and increasing demands placed on students throughout the experience (Schultz-Krohn & Pendleton, 2002). In developing weekly objectives for her future fieldwork students, Jean looked at pertinent AOTA documents (e.g., Standards of Practice for Occupational Therapy) and compared them to the statements from the Fieldwork Performance Evaluation (FWPE) form (e.g., Basic Tenets of Occupational Therapy) (AOTA 2002b) and information on how to use the forms (Atler & Wimmer, 2003). The FWPE form identifies seven content areas for occupational therapy students and six content areas for occupational therapy assistant students. A minimum passing score is included on each form. Both forms identify the first content area addressing safety and adherence to the ethics of occupational therapy as the Fundamentals of Practice (AOTA, 2002a; AOTA 2002b). Adhering to the Fundamentals of Practice section is required by the ACOTE Standard for passing the Level II fieldwork experience—the site develops specific objectives that measure how a student will demonstrate the skills included in the Fundamentals of Practice. Students at the technical or graduate level who do not meet the Fundamentals of Practice standards will fail the Level II fieldwork regardless of the total score on the FWPE. In addition to Fundamentals of Practice, occupational therapy and occupational therapy assistant students must address the following areas: Basic Tenets of Occupational Therapy, Evaluation and Screening, Intervention, Communication, and Professional Behaviors. The FWPE for occupational therapy students also includes Management of Occupational Therapy Services.

To develop a series of weekly objectives, Jean considered what entry-level practice expectations would be appropriate for occupational therapists at her site in each of the seven FWPE content areas. She then developed incremental steps in the form of weekly objectives for students to progress toward the goal of competent entry-level practice. Within the content area of safety and ethics addressed in the Fundamentals of Practice, Jean considered the need for students to be able to safely handle medically compromised infants and
toddlers in the home setting. She also addressed the behavioral issues often seen with this client group and added Level II fieldwork objectives to help students develop safety skills and ethical judgment. Providing safe care and navigating ethical challenges is challenging, so Jean wanted to provide clear expectations for the student (Estes & Brandt, 2011). She developed the following series of objectives to be met during the first 2 weeks of the Level II fieldwork:
1. The student will identify three safety risks when working with infants and toddlers in the home and at the early intervention center.
2. The student will identify potential ethical concerns with issues of discipline.
3. The student will describe how to safely intervene when a child displays a behavioral outburst, such as crying, hitting, or biting.
4. The student will describe how to safely intervene with positioning devices and handling when a child displays poor head and trunk control.

In meeting these initial objectives, students would be able to demonstrate essential knowledge of safety and ethical issues. Jean then developed additional objectives, to be met in subsequent weeks, for students to demonstrate safe and ethical behavior during interventions. By analyzing the site expectations and using AOTA documents, Jean then developed similar objectives for each section of the FWPE to support students making the transition to entry-level clinician. Developing specific, incremental Level II fieldwork objectives provides clear expectations of students reaching the ultimate goal of demonstrating entry-level competence.

Table 1 on p. CE-6 provides a mechanism to align specific Level II fieldwork objectives at a fieldwork site with the FWPE, using AOTA documents as a guide.

REFLECTIVE PRACTICE
The two levels of fieldwork experience are designed to help occupational therapy students at the technical and graduate levels transition to occupational therapy practitioners (Santalucia & Johnson, 2010). Although Level I fieldwork is tied to academic programs, often with an emphasis on developing observational skills and accepting graded responsibilities, even this fieldwork experience can be challenging for students, who may be uncomfortable making clinical decisions based on several variables instead of finding a single, correct answer. Level I fieldwork allows occupational therapy students to engage in clinical reasoning activities in a controlled, supported environment (Hooper, 2008). At one school-based practice, for example, Level I fieldwork students get the chance to observe occupational therapists providing suggestions and activities to classroom teachers to foster improved handwriting skills for all children in the class. The school district where this Level I fieldwork program operates supports the use of RIT (Clark & Polichino, 2010), through which general suggestions can be made and provided to an entire classroom instead of making a referral for a specific child in that class to be seen by the occupational therapist. One day, at the beginning of a typical Level I fieldwork experience at this program, an occupational therapy student—not fully understanding the tenets of RIT and using procedural reasoning to make sense of a situation given her limited experience (Hooper, 2008)—expressed confusion that the occupational therapist did not request a referral for a particular child in the classroom who was struggling with handwriting. In response, the occupational therapist explained that by using conditional reasoning, the demands of the classroom are considered along with the needs of the children (Boyt Schell & Schell, 2008). All children may benefit from the suggestions provided, which won't occur if the therapist immediately requests that the child with handwriting issues be referred for an occupational therapy evaluation. This example of labeling clinical reasoning and explaining why a specific form of clinical reasoning is preferable helped the Level I fieldwork student experience the complexity of services.

Compared with Level I fieldwork, Level II fieldwork places far greater expectations on student performance. This change may be seamless for some students. For others, shifting from student to practitioner is difficult. At the Level II fieldwork sites, students are expected to transform relatively quickly into occupational therapy practitioners competent to serve clients (Santalucia & Johnson, 2010). During Level II fieldwork, students expect supervisors to actively foster clinical reasoning and help them apply that ability to practice (Alfaro-LeFevre, 2009; Farber & Koenig, 2008). Engaging Level II fieldwork students in self-reflection (Hansen, Larsen, & Nielsen, 2011) can promote more interactive and conditional reasoning. Interactive reasoning is seen when students are able to adjust the intervention strategies during a session to meet the client's occupational preferences and needs. Conditional reasoning requires students to consider possible futures for the clients and how several variables may interact and influence selecting and implementing intervention approaches.

At one particular homeless shelter that provides Level II fieldwork opportunities, an exercise to promote conditional reasoning asks occupational therapy students to write a progress note in advance of a session working with teenagers to foster money management skills. Students must imagine the best outcome of the session and, using the Subjective–Objective–Action–Plan (SOAP) note format, document the results of the session. Students then imagine the worst outcome about the same intervention and write another SOAP note. This exercise helps students consider the potential range of outcomes for any session. Students are then asked to identify what strategies could be used to improve the likelihood of the best outcome occurring as a result of the inter-
## Table 1. Using AOTA Documents To Align Level II Fieldwork Objectives With the Fieldwork Performance Evaluation Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fieldwork Performance Evaluation Form Sections for Occupational Therapy Students</th>
<th>AOTA Documents</th>
<th>Site Considerations</th>
<th>Fieldwork Student Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Practice</td>
<td>• AOTA Code of Ethics and Ethics Standards (2010) (AOTA, 2010b); • Contextual considerations</td>
<td>List three primary safety risks at setting</td>
<td>Specify adherence to safety, confidentiality, and judgment in ethical issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Tenets of Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>• Standards of Practice for Occupational Therapy (AOTA, 2010e) • Standards for Continuing Competence (AOTA, 2010d)</td>
<td>Identify primary role of occupational therapy and key professionals/staff</td>
<td>Specify client collaboration and collaboration with other professionals/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Screening</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy Practice Framework: Domain and Process, 2nd Edition (Framework-II: AOTA, 2008); Occupational profile and analysis of occupational performance</td>
<td>• List three primary occupations addressed • List the three most-used assessment tools</td>
<td>Competence in assessing occupational performance and use of tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Framework-II (AOTA, 2008); Plan, implement, and review, includes approaches of: • Create/promote • Establish/restore/maintain • Modify/compensate • Prevent</td>
<td>Identify three primary approaches used for intervention, including Frame of Reference or models that guide intervention</td>
<td>• Competence in planning and executing intervention • Competence in altering intervention in response to client and additional issues/concerns from other professionals/staff or significant others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Occupational Therapy Services</td>
<td>• Framework-II (AOTA, 2008); Outcomes of intervention: occupational performance, client satisfaction, role competence, adaptation, health and wellness, prevention, quality of life • Guidelines for Supervision, Roles, and Responsibilities During the Delivery of Occupational Therapy Services (AOTA, 2009b)</td>
<td>• Identify three primary outcomes for clients served at setting • Identify external constraints of funding and time affecting intervention • Identify the role of assistants/aides</td>
<td>• Competence in meeting productivity standards • Responsible plans that meet constraints of setting • Entry-level supervisory skills with assistants/aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Framework-II (AOTA, 2008); Process is communicated, including evaluation/intervention/outcomes</td>
<td>Specify the method and frequency of meetings and written reports</td>
<td>Competence in reporting for written and oral requirements of setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Behaviors</td>
<td>• Occupational Therapy Code of Ethics and Ethics Standards (2010) (AOTA, 2010b) • Scope of Practice (AOTA, 2010c) • Standards of Practice for Occupational Therapy (AOTA, 2010e) • Standards for Continuing Competence (AOTA 2010d)</td>
<td>• Identify specific professional behaviors within the setting • Identify expectations for professional growth</td>
<td>• Compliance with professional behaviors and quality of self-directed professional growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This reflective exercise promotes conditional reasoning within the students during the first few weeks of Level II fieldwork at the shelter.

Using reflective exercises such as journaling during Level II fieldwork helps give students a sense of becoming occupational therapy practitioners (Hansen et al., 2011). The initial journaling may focus on the feelings students experience during good and not-so-good situations occurring in the first few weeks of Level II fieldwork. Continued journaling over the course of a few weeks can focus on effective and ineffective intervention strategies and consider what additional variables could contribute to session outcomes. This reflection fosters interactive reasoning prior to sessions so that students can be better prepared to respond to unusual events during the intervention sessions (Farber & Koenig, 2008). The reflective journaling can also be used for a retrospective analysis of the types of observations, feelings, and responses made during the initial weeks of Level II fieldwork and compare those with entries during the final weeks of the experience. This approach can help students appreciate their professional evolution during Level II fieldwork (Santalaria & Johnson, 2010). Students may gravitate toward procedural reasoning but, with support and guidance, interactive and conditional reasoning can be fostered through the fieldwork experience.
CONCLUSION
Level I and Level II fieldwork helps students understand the occupational needs of clients within various settings, apply skills learned during the academic preparation to practice, and transform from the role of the student to a competent entry-level occupational therapy practitioner. The shift from student to practitioner can be guided through clear expectations stated in fieldwork objectives and through the use of reflective journaling. Using these approaches, students are able to envision their role not only as students but as entry-level practitioners.
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1. According to the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE®), who can supervise an occupational therapy graduate student completing Level I fieldwork?
   A. An occupational therapist
   B. An occupational therapy assistant
   C. A teacher
   D. All of the above

2. According to ACOTE, who can supervise an occupational therapy graduate student completing Level II fieldwork?
   A. An occupational therapist with 1 year of experience
   B. An occupational therapy assistant with 1 year of experience
   C. A teacher with 1 year of experience
   D. All of the above

3. The student learning objectives for Level I fieldwork at a school or early intervention site should be developed by:
   A. The academic program
   B. The site
   C. The student
   D. The Level I fieldwork supervisor

4. The outcome of Level I fieldwork is to prepare the student to:
   A. Make accurate observations of client behavior
   B. Understand the occupational needs of clients
   C. Identify the type of service provided at the site
   D. All of the above

5. Level II fieldwork prepares students to:
   A. Supervise other Level II fieldwork students at the site
   B. Be entry-level occupational therapy generalist practitioners
   C. Gain advanced practice skills to meet specific challenges at the fieldwork site
   D. All of the above

6. Which of the following types of students must complete at least 24 weeks of full-time fieldwork?
   A. Occupational therapy students completing Level I fieldwork
   B. Occupational therapy assistant students completing Level I fieldwork
   C. Occupational therapy students completing Level II fieldwork
   D. Occupational therapy assistant students completing Level II fieldwork

7. For both occupational therapy and occupational therapy assistant students to ultimately pass Level II fieldwork, which content area on the Fieldwork Performance Evaluation (FWPE) form must be passed as meeting the site standard?
   A. Basic Tenets of Occupational Therapy
   B. Management of Occupational Therapy Services
   C. Fundamentals of Practice
   D. Evaluation and Screening

8. As a reflection of entry-level competence, the FWPE form includes which content area for occupational therapy students but not occupational therapy assistant students?
   A. Basic Tenets of Occupational Therapy
   B. Management of Occupational Therapy Services
   C. Fundamentals of Practice
   D. Evaluation and Screening

9. Students who request that a teacher submit a referral for an occupational therapy evaluation prior to offering any suggestions to address a child’s needs are using which type of clinical reasoning?
   A. Procedural reasoning
   B. Conditional reasoning
   C. Interactive reasoning
   D. All of the above

10. Asking Level II fieldwork students to write progress notes in advance of actual sessions and anticipate the best and worst outcomes allows students to further develop their:
    A. Procedural reasoning
    B. Conditional reasoning
    C. Interactive reasoning
    D. All of the above

11. Students able to modify and adjust interventions during actual sessions to better meet the client’s needs use:
    A. Procedural reasoning
    B. Conditional reasoning
    C. Interactive reasoning
    D. All of the above

12. To help Level II fieldwork students recognize the transformation to a competent occupational therapy practitioner, Level II fieldwork sites should ask students to:
    A. Read several articles about practices at a similar Level II fieldwork site
    B. Review the notes of Level II fieldwork supervisors and other professionals
    C. Watch the therapy sessions of several different professionals
    D. Engage in self-reflective journaling and complete reflective exercises