Board of Occupational Therapy 2015 Environmental Scan

Prepared by Elisa Chohan
SOLID Planning Solutions
Department of Consumer Affairs
May 2015

solid
planning solutions

Table of Contents

Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2
INTRODUCTION 3
ENFORCEMENT 4
APPLICANT QUALIFICATIONS 8
LAWS AND REGULATIONS 9
OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION 11
ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS 12
APPENDIX A: COMMENTS 14
APPENDIX B: MAJOR TRENDS AND CHANGES 47
APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY OF TERMS 51
APPENDIX D: DATA COLLECTION METHOD 52
APPENDIX E: STAKEHOLDER SURVEY REPRESENTATION 53
APPENDIX F: SURVEY DATA RELIABILITY 54

Introduction

One of the first steps in developing a strategic plan is to conduct a scan and analysis of the environment in which an organization operates. This analysis allows us to take a look at the factors that can impact the organization's success. This is a summary of the results of the environmental scan recently conducted by SOLID for the California Board of Occupational Therapy in May 2015.

The purpose of this environmental scan is to provide a better understanding of stakeholder, Board member and Board staff thoughts about the Board's performance within the following categories:

- Enforcement
- Applicant Qualifications
- Laws and Regulations
- Outreach and Communication
- Organizational Effectiveness

This document outlines areas where Board members, staff and stakeholders are in agreement and disagreement while providing additional insight to assist the Board in developing goals and objectives for the upcoming strategic plan.

Please review this information carefully in preparation for the upcoming strategic planning session. At this planning session, we will discuss and evaluate this information as a group to help us identify new strategic objectives the Board will focus on during the next strategic plan period.

If you have any questions about this report, please contact Elisa Chohan with SOLID at (916) 574-7763 or Elisa.Chohan@dca.ca.gov.

Enforcement

The Board enforces the laws and regulations governing occupational therapy by effectively investigating complaints, non-compliance, and irregularities, and concluding with an appropriate response.

Enforcement includes complaint intake, internal investigations, licensee disciplinary actions, the hearing process, investigation cycle times and the enforcement knowledge of Board staff. Enforcement also includes the Board's relationships with the Attorney General's office and with the Office of Administrative Hearings, as well as proactive Board activities that mitigate the need for enforcement.

Enforcement Effectiveness

Investigations

Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	20.4% (42.3%*)	11	80.0%	66.8%
Effective	27.8% (57.7%)	15	20.0%	33.3%
Poor	0%	0	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0	0%	0%
Not applicable	51.9%	28	0%	0%
Total	100%	54	100%	100%

**Parenthetical percentages indicate the percent of responses that chose to rate this area.*

Enforcement Effectiveness Resolving complaints in a timely manner				
Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	13.0% (33.4%)	7	40.0%	33.3%
Effective	24.1% (61.8%)	13	60.0%	50.0%
Poor	1.9% (4.2%)	1	0%	16.7%
Very poor	0%	0	0%	0%
Not applicable	61.1%	33	0%	0%
Total	100%	54	100%	100%

Enforcement Effectiveness Appropriate response in resolving enforcement matters				
Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	21.2% (52.5%)	11	40%	100%
Effective	19.2% (47.5%)	10	60%	0%
Poor	0%	0	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0	0%	0%
Not applicable	59.6%	31	0%	0%
Total	100%	52	100%	100%

Enforcement Strengths

1. *The Board's main focus is consumer protection and they take their mandate seriously.*
2. *The staff is responsive to stakeholders.*
3. *The enforcement and investigation processes are thorough with a complete review that is fair and balanced.*
4. *Internal communication is good and the Board partners well with external entities and agencies.*
5. *Considering the limited resources, timeframes are good.*

Enforcement Weaknesses

1. *The Board is dependent on numerous external agencies to complete investigation processes, and the external agencies are not held to any specific timeframes.*
2. *The Board does a fair job communicating the enforcement process to licensees.*
3. *The Board is suffering from staffing shortages in the area of Enforcement.*
4. *BreEZe[1] is impacting the workflow and timeframes in a negative way.*
5. *The Board is dealing with a lack of resources including staffing and funding.*

[1] BreEZe is the Board's new licensing and enforcement tracking system.

DCA Performance Measures Summary

The performance measures demonstrate that DCA is making the most efficient and effective use of resources. Performance measures are linked directly to an agency's mission, vision, strategic objectives and strategic initiatives. The chart below shows the number of days between the stages of investigating a consumer complaint for the Board. The column labeled "target" is the goal the Board has established for itself. The remaining columns show the actual number of days to move a complaint from one step of the investigation process to the next.

The Board is exceeding its targets in all areas that have data for the last two quarters of 2014, with the exception of quarter four formal discipline.

Glossary of Performance Measure Terms

Volume - Number of complaints and convictions received.

Intake - Average cycle time from complaint receipt to the date the complaint was assigned to an investigator.

Intake & Investigation - Average cycle time from complaint receipt to closure of the investigation process. Does not include cases sent to the Attorney General or other forms of formal discipline.

Formal Discipline - Average number of days to complete the entire enforcement process for cases resulting in formal discipline. (Includes intake and investigation by the Board and prosecution by the Attorney General.)

Probation Intake - Average number of days from monitor assignment to the date the monitor makes first contact with the probationer.

Probation Violation Response - Average number of days from the date a violation of probation is reported, to the date the assigned monitor initiates appropriate action.

		Q3 July – September 2014	Q4 October – December 2014	2013-2014 FY Average per quarter
Performance Measure	Target	Actual	Actual	Actual
Volume (number of complaints)	---	180	156	749 (total year)
Intake (days)	2	1	1	1
Intake & investigation (days)	270	161	107	104
Formal discipline (days)	540	312	765	642
Probation intake (days)	10	N/A	6	1
Probation violation response (days)	10	N/A	3	1

Applicant Qualifications

The Board ensures those seeking licensure meet professional standards of conduct, education, fieldwork and examination.

Licensing refers to the initial application submission process for obtaining a license from the Board, as well as the renewal process. Licensing includes processing times, processing backlogs, and responsiveness of Board staff to initial and renewal applicant inquires. Inquires may include information from the Board about the licensing process and licensing requirements, and eligibility criteria for licensure.

Applicant Qualifications Effectiveness

Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	36.2% (47.7%)	21	60%	100%
Effective	39.7% (53.3%)	23	20%	0%
Poor	0%	0	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0	0%	0%
Not applicable	24.1%	14	20%	0%
Total	100%	58	100%	100%

Applicant Qualifications Strengths

1. *The application review process is thorough, timely and efficient.*
2. *The licensee requirements are strong.*
3. *The personnel in this unit are great.*
4. *Internal communication is strong within this unit.*

Applicant Qualifications Weaknesses

1. *The advanced practice and renewal processes take too long.*
2. *Outreach to schools regarding requirements and processes could be better.*
3. *External entities' timeframes take too long and affect the Board's response time.*
4. *BreEZe has affected staffing resources at the Board.*

Laws and Regulations

The Board monitors evolving trends and standards in occupational therapy, modify statutes and regulations as needed, and promptly inform licensees of these changes.

Laws and regulations include the federal laws governing the occupational therapy profession as well as California's clarifying regulations.

Laws and Regulations Effectiveness
Monitoring trends in industry

Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	17.3% (21.4%)	9	20%	66.7%
Effective	53.8% (66.7%)	28	60%	33.3%
Poor	7.7% (9.5%)	4	20%	0%
Very poor	1.9% (2.4%)	1	0%	0%
Not applicable	19.2%	10	0%	0%
Total	100%	52	100%	100%

Laws and Regulations Effectiveness
Modifying statutes and regulations

Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	17.0% (22.5%)	9	40%	83.3%
Effective	52.8% (69.9%)	28	60%	16.7%
Poor	5.7% (7.5%)	3	0%	0%
Very poor	0%	0	0%	0%
Not applicable	24.5%	13	0%	0%
Total	100%	53	100%	100%

Laws and Regulations Effectiveness Notifying licensees about changes				
Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	13.7% (17.9%)	17	20%	66.8%
Effective	35.3% (46.1%)	18	40%	16.7%
Poor	25.5% (33.3%)	13	20%	16.7%
Very poor	2.0% (2.6%)	1	0%	0%
Not applicable	23.5%	12	20%	0%
Total	100%	51	100%	100%

Laws and Regulations Strengths

1. *The Board communicates pending legislation and updates to stakeholders through email developed from an interested parties list.*
2. *Board seems aware of industry trends and responds to them promptly.*
3. *The personnel who deal with laws and regulations are great.*

Laws and Regulations Weaknesses

1. *The Board could do more to educate stakeholders about laws and regulations.*
2. *The legislative process takes too long.*
3. *Staff deals with a high call volume of questions related to laws and regulations, yet has limited resources to answer these questions.*
4. *It seems that the Board could be more proactive and less reactive when it comes to regulating the industry.*
5. *The Board does not have varied methods of communicating changes to laws and regulations, other than its Web site and email.*

Outreach and Communication

The Board informs the public and other entities about occupational therapy requirements, evidence-based practices, standards and trends through accessible "green" communication methods.

Outreach and Communication refers to the Board's ability to communicate with consumers, licensees and other stakeholders using various techniques such as: social media, print, television and radio media and public forums.

Outreach and Communication Effectiveness

Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	10.0% (13.2%)	5	20%	66.7%
Effective	30.0% (39.5%)	15	20%	33.3%
Poor	30.0% (39.5%)	15	40%	0%
Very poor	6.0% (7.9%)	3	0%	0%
Not applicable	24.0%	12	20%	0%
Total	100%	50	100%	100%

Outreach and Communication Strengths

1. *In-person presentations that staff and Board members conduct are great.*
2. *Electronic communication through email is great.*
3. *Generally, the Board is doing a good job communicating.*
4. *The Board's relationships with schools are great.*
5. *The Web site is a good resource for stakeholders.*

Outreach and Communication Weaknesses

1. *The Board has not put forth any evidence-based practices information, yet it is in the goal statement.*
2. *The Board has not attempted any green communication, yet it is in the goal statement.*
3. *The Board lacks resources for a robust outreach program.*
4. *The Board lacks a comprehensive method to inform licensees; the Listserv is not effective.*
5. *The Board lacks alternative outreach methods.*

Organizational Effectiveness

Build an excellent organization through proper Board governance, effective leadership, and responsible management by securing necessary funding and ensuring responsive staff processes.

Organizational effectiveness includes the administrative management of the Board, staffing levels, fiscal resources, organizational structure and customer service.

Organizational Effectiveness
Overall

Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	10.0% (15.6%)	5	40%	33.3%
Effective	40.0% (62.5%	20	60%	66.7%
Poor	14.0% (21.9%)	7	0%	0%
Very poor	0.0%	0	0%	0%
Not applicable	36.0%	18	0%	0%
Total	100%	50	100%	100%

Organizational Effectiveness
Leadership

Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	14.3% (23.3%)	7	60%	66.7%
Effective	38.8% (63.3%)	19	40%	33.3%
Poor	8.2% (13.4%)	4	0%	0%
Very poor	0.0%	0	0%	0%
Not applicable	38.8%	19	0%	0%
Total	100%	49	100%	100%

Organizational Effectiveness Ensuring responsive staff and processes				
Rating	External Stakeholders	Number of Stakeholders Responses	Board Members	Board Staff
Very effective	9.8% (14.7%)	5	40%	83.3%
Effective	35.3% (52.9%)	18	60%	16.7%
Poor	21.6% (32.4%)	11	0%	0%
Very poor	0.0%	0	0%	0%
Not applicable	33.3%	17	0%	0%
Total	100%	51	100%	100%

Organizational Effectiveness Strengths

1. *Staff is overall responsive and timely.*
2. *The Executive Officer (EO) is great.*
3. *The Board handles coverage well and staff members are cross-trained.*
4. *The management style of the EO and lead staff is great.*
5. *The Board staff are all team orientated.*
6. *Board meetings run smoothly.*

Organizational Effectiveness Weaknesses

1. *Since BreEZe, timeliness in responding to phone messages and emails has been delayed.*
2. *BreEZe has impacted staff resources, timeliness and processes in a negative way; not because of inefficiencies but because staff is tied up with other things.*
3. *There has been no succession planning for the EO.*
4. *Board members note some logistical issues with Board meeting notices, causing inconsistencies.*

Appendix A: Comments

This appendix contains the qualitative data relating to the Board of Occupational Therapy strengths and weaknesses collected during the stakeholder survey, and staff and Board member interviews.

The comments in this appendix are shown as provided by stakeholders, staff and Board members. Comments that appear similar or on a specific topic have been organized into categories. The comments have not been edited for grammar or punctuation in order to preserve the accuracy, feeling and/or meaning the participant intended when providing the comment.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Enforcement Strengths

Consumer Protection

1. The Board takes strong action to protect the public.
2. I think they are highly dedicated to consumer safety.
3. The Board's focus is on strong consumer protection, but they are not overly-punitive.

Responsiveness

1. They have always been timely when responding to me.
2. Staff are very collaborative and highly responsive.

Resources

1. The Board staff is efficient and effective working within the constraints of the state system (i.e. budget/staffing and the Office of the Attorney General's timeliness).
2. They do the best they can with the resources they have.

Investigation Process

1. The investigative processes are very thorough and complete.
2. The rationales for actions cited in the consent orders are very clearly written.
3. Good committee of therapists that carefully reviews cases.
4. Fair and balanced approach, giving the licensees the right to make their side of the issue heard as well as the person bringing the complaint.
5. I know through a colleague, communication was good.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Enforcement Strengths

Processes and Timeframes

1. The Board has finally gotten to a point where everything is running as efficient as possible. BreEZe[2] implementation will affect this drastically over the next several years.
2. Enforcement processes are efficient and thorough.
3. There are only two to three staff members in this unit, but everything is still running smoothly and complaints are being handled as quickly as possible.
4. Every complaint is taken seriously, and processed to the best of staff's abilities.
5. The staff are good people and they try to keep up with everything.

Consumer Protection

1. A consumer protection agency can never process complaints fast enough; however, if compared to other boards, we are doing well.
2. We are a consumer protection agency and we take it seriously.
3. The Board members deliver righteous decisions designed to protect consumers.

Communication and Partnerships

1. Staff partners well with management and legal department to resolve cases.
2. The enforcement team works really well together and we want to work harder because we want the Board to be successful.
3. Communication between the Licensing and Enforcement Units is great.
4. Communication between team members is good because we all work well together.
5. The work completed by external entities (Division of Investigation) is of great quality.

Other

1. Staff have created desk manuals; however staff does not have the time to continuously update them.
2. The unit does a lot of work!
3. The unit does a great job!

[2] BreEZe is the Board's new licensing and enforcement tracking system.

Board Member Comments Regarding Enforcement Strengths

Personnel Related to Communication, Processing and Promptness

1. Staff is doing well in terms of responsiveness on timelines, investigations and informing the Board on important information.
2. The staff is fair and honest, not punitive.
3. When staff sees that an enforcement action is needed, they take care of it promptly.
4. Staff is very good at resolving issues and negotiating with licensees before they result in disciplinary action taken by the Board.

Processes

1. Enforcement related polices are clear.
2. The disciplinary action process for Board members is efficient.
3. This area is effective to very effective, specifically in the area of investigations.
4. The Board is meeting timeframes.

Communication

1. There is good communication between staff, legal and the licensee during the stipulated settlement process.
2. Anytime you have a group of people trying to agree on disciplinary cases there will be disagreements, however we always have good discussions.

Other

1. The Board handles this area very well.
2. The Board processes a good number of disciplinary actions and settlements.
3. Procedurally, the Board is doing a very good job in this area.
4. Considering the large number of licensees, staff does a great job at managing workload and keeping licensees away from discipline.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Enforcement Weaknesses

Timeframes

1. Though we understand California is a large state with higher volume, it has been observed that investigations can take extended periods of time to resolve.
2. It takes a long time with processes and communicating to committee members all documents, etc.

Outreach about the Process

1. Perhaps the Board should use education more effective sometimes.
2. I think the Board could communicate more with licensees about the enforcement process.

Other

1. In my opinion, the Board members themselves do not ALWAYS make the best decision about enforcement cases. I believe this may be due to lack of knowledge and guidance (i.e. by Board Counsel, general training). The Board members need more training in this area.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Enforcement Weaknesses

Staff Shortage and Timeframe Increases

1. The Board is short staffed which causes the workload to increase for each person, but it hasn't caused burn out or the process times to suffer.
2. We still have vacancies.

BreEZe Impact

1. Workload has and will continue to increase because of BreEZe. Our timeframes and case aging will increase over the next few years as a consequence of BreEZe.

External Agencies

1. Have to wait on other entities (DOJ, DOI and the Office of the Attorney General (OAG)) to send in pertinent information, which slows down our processes.
2. Performance measures reflect the time stalls from external entities, yet we don't have any control over them.

Board Member Comments Regarding Enforcement Weaknesses

External Agencies

1. Our assigned attorney has turned over several times over the last few years. We need consistency from DCA so we can know the unique style of the attorney and learn how they explain the process and law to Board members.
2. The cost of using the OAG's office to complete investigations is very high. It can be difficult trying to coordinate with them in a timely and cost efficient way. It is also difficult to budget for the costs of the investigations because they cross over quarters and fiscal years.
3. The DCA legal team needs to better educate Board members on how to enact and regulate laws.

Timelines

1. BreEZe and/or staff shortages have caused some missed timelines.
2. Our timelines are too long, but we do not have any control of some of the timelines because they are externally influenced. However, we are being measured on those timelines.

Funding

1. The Board could do more if we had more resources.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Applicant Qualifications Strengths

Application Review Process

1. Staff look at each applicant individually and when there is a potential problem they research it thoroughly.
2. Staff conduct a thorough investigation into applicant's records prior to issuance of a license and posts license information on Web site in a timely manner.
3. The Board provides a thorough, efficient/timely, and fair review of applications.
4. Overall, there is a thorough review of applications and suitability for professional licensure.
5. They are detailed with applicant background checks to ensure applicants are meeting requirements.
6. I believe the Board takes its role in this area very seriously and does its best job to uphold and enforce applicant qualifications.

Strength of Requirements

1. Education guidelines and the exam seem strong.
2. The requirements are well spelled out and consistent.

Other

1. They are efficient in notification and response time.
2. When we are submitting renewal applications, the office is generally efficient, if all is ok.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Applicant Qualifications Strengths

Processing and Timeframes

1. The Board is processing applications as efficiently as possible, sometimes in less than one week.
2. The Board is mandated to notify applicants within 30 days whether their application is complete, deficient or approved.
3. The Board meets the 30 day notification timeframe, even when we are backlogged.
4. Applicants receive a letter if they are deficient, explaining what they need to get to the Board in order to complete their application.
5. Licensing log with all information for each application with status is shared so anyone can answer questions if an applicant calls.
6. The process works pretty well.

Standards and Requirements

1. The Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy (ACOT) sets standards for both domestic and international candidates, which makes it very clear for the Board to enforce.
2. The ACOT now has education requirements that include advanced practice training.
3. Backlogs do not occur and haven't occurred since 2012.
4. The BOT application is thorough and well-rounded with education, exam and fieldwork requirements.
5. The Board sets high standards for licensure which yields top notch licensees.
6. In 2006, the Board passed a self-certification continuing education requirement and Board staff have consistently audited 5%-10% of self-certifications for several years.

Personnel

1. The licensing technician is great; she turns around applications quicker than most other boards.
2. The EO is a good source for help and she stays on top of everything.
3. The relationship and communication between the Licensing Unit and the Enforcement Unit is good. They can resolve issues quickly.
4. Everyone in the office can answer most calls, especially because of the updated application status spreadsheets.

Board Member Comments Regarding Applicant Qualifications Strengths

Processing and Timeframes

1. The licensure process is accessible and forthright.
2. The staff processes and responds to applicants in a timely manner.
3. A while ago, universities were taking too long to send transcripts for limited term permit applicants. The Board responded to that problem by adjusting our internal process and consequently better met the needs of applicants.
4. Timeframes for processing applications are good compared to other boards.
5. I haven't heard applicants complain about not getting their licenses in timely manner.

Standards and Requirements

1. Nationally set standards are strong and we enforce those high standards at the state level.
2. The national exam is rigorous.
3. The licensing requirements are balanced between access to the profession and protection of the consumer.
4. The national certification exam works.

Personnel

1. The staff does a good job in this area.
2. The staff seem competent.
3. The EO synthesizes information for Board members well. She is diligent in her research and prepares Board members on potential legislation, how a violation fits into past practices, and educates us on the shift from hands-on therapy to telehealth.

Other

1. If a candidate is not honest about their background, staff will investigate. Therefore, the Board manages to catch people through the application process.
2. Licensing efforts are very good, which leads to the end result of not having a lot of issues.
3. There are a lot of good professionals in the field; therefore the Board must be doing a good job licensing qualified people. 8
4. Professional Board members provide a lot of guidance to public members.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Applicant Qualifications Weaknesses

Renewals

1. If there is a problem with a renewal, we are not notified; but others looking online can see that our applications have been stalled. I wish that if there is a difficulty with our credits, we would be notified by email as soon as it occurs; thus we would be able to rectify errors quickly.
2. The renewal process takes too long.

Timeliness

1. Gathering all needed items can be time consuming.
2. Time delays in license review and advanced practice applications are too frequent.
3. The application process can still be a bit slow.
4. The process for approving or disapproving advanced practice applications is frustratingly slow.

Other

1. Censure for change of address issues seems a bit harsh.
2. Communicating to applicants what requirements are needed could be better.
3. The difference between PDUs, CEUs, and CE is confusing.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Applicant Qualifications Weaknesses

School Outreach about Licensing Processing

1. Education programs could do a better job at teaching students the laws and regulations that they will have to obey by once they become licensed.
2. Schools need to inform students of application process. Specifically, graduates need to know they can apply right away without taking the exam. The Board would just keep their application pending until exam results are updated. This would save the applicants a lot of time.
3. Students need to be better informed about Board's processes.
4. The Board has a newer regulation requiring a $50 application fee. There is also an initial license fee which is different than the application fee. Applicants are confused between application fee and the initial application fee.

External Agencies Timeframes

1. Fingerprinting requirements and wait time from the DOJ and FBI can take 4-6 weeks, which causes frustration from applicants.
2. DOJ does not have timeframes or goals they have to meet, yet we do and we are held up because of them.

BreEZe

1. BreEZe can potentially impact workload and efficiencies in both positive and negative ways.
2. Right now we cannot do anything online, with the exception of some schools that are submitting transcripts electronically.

Processes

1. There are too many application deficiencies, which causes hold ups in the processing times. Applicants do not read the instructions thoroughly enough. Perhaps the Board should create an application submittal checklist to help eliminate the high number of deficiencies.
2. The Board does not have pre-screening criteria or guidelines to share with perspective applicants so they can determine if their backgrounds could prevent future licensure.

Staffing Resources

1. The Board is understaffed in this area.
2. Since 2006, there have been three new schools opened, two new universities opened OT programs and one school with an OT and an OTA program, of which, two will have their first graduating class next May, yet we have not added any staff.
3. The number of applications has drastically increased over the years, peaking in 2014 with 1300, yet only one person is allocated to licensing.
4. In the 2013-2014 fiscal year, the Board received a 34% increase in the number of complaints, yet we have not added any staff.
5. In the 2014 calendar year, BreEZe was a huge drain on resources (In November 2014 staff were out 20 days attending contractual review required meetings).

6. The consequence of BreEZe and being understaffed was that our timeframes went up. But not because of inefficiencies or processes, but because staff were not here.

Other

1. Some Board members do not know a lot about the profession and could learn more. We only see the negative part when licensees are in front of us for discipline.

Board Member Comments Regarding Applicant Qualifications Weaknesses

BreEZe and Staff Shortages Impact

1. DCA has tied up staff in the BreEZe project, which is unfortunate because the licensees suffer with less customer service.
2. Staff says BreEZe is occupying a lot of their time.
3. The Board has a few unfilled positions, which is hindering internal processing timeframes.
4. The way people view our Board has been affected by BreEZe and staff shortages.

Advanced Practice

1. The responsiveness with advanced practice issues has been questionable.
2. California and national standards for advanced practice (i.e.: hand therapy, physical agent modalities, swallowing) were not formulated simultaneously. Therefore the Board is trying to catch up in matching the two.

National Level Requirements and Relationship

1. The national requirements for licensure are vague enough that not all schools are offering the same courses and knowledge.
2. The relationship with the national level decision makers could be improved and the Board could advocate for higher education standards at the national level.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Laws and Regulations Strengths

Communication

1. The Board is good at sending out emails with proposed revisions and/or new legislation.
2. There is good communication and information given at Occupational Therapy Association of California (OTAC) meetings and on the Board Web site.
3. I like the "interested parties" email list option if a licensee wants to be alerted to proposed changes in laws and regulations.
4. The Board sends notices to anyone subscribing to the Board's Listserv and posts pending regulations on their Web site.
5. I receive an email if there are changes.

Awareness of Trends

1. I think the Board is effective in monitoring trends and standards in OT, and in the modification of statues and regulations.
2. The awareness of trends within our profession is great, even paving the way for the country sometimes.
3. They always seem to be willing to take on matters that may need attention.
4. The Board appears to be actively linked to state agencies and organizations to assure we are meeting the needs of therapists and consumers.

Policy Process

1. The state's legislative and regulatory modification process is very thorough.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Laws and Regulations Strengths

Public Notification

1. Notification to public about upcoming and proposed regulations is great. The person who updates the Web site, does so promptly based on the direction of the EO.
2. The Board has sent out mailings to notify licensees about changes and updates to regulations.

Personnel

1. Heather and Jeff handle this workload and do a great job.
2. Only one person is responsible for updating the Web site and they do it promptly and accurately.

Others

1. The Board was the frontrunner in telehealth regulations.
2. Regulations are clear, for the most part.

Board Member Comments Regarding Laws and Regulations Strengths

Responsiveness to Industry Issues

1. The Board continuously develops new standards to meet changing needs of the industry.
2. The Board does a good job identifying issues and developing standards to regulate issues.
3. The Board is effective and responds quickly to industry issues such as telehealth.

Other

1. Board members are not threatened by changes in industry and are open to change.
2. The Web site materials are updated in timely manner and people can see regulations in an effective way.
3. When legislation is pending and the Board did not bring it forward, the Board is kept informed by staff about the status of the legislation.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Laws and Regulations Weaknesses

Newsletter and Listserv

1. It was much better years ago when the Board sent regular newsletters to inform licensees.
2. Promotion of their electronic mailing lists could be improved. I used to be on an "interested parties" mailing list, but somehow that was discontinued, because I haven't received anything from them in a long time.

General Communication

1. There is little support when asking questions on regulations. There is poor response to phone calls or e-mails and changes in staffing leaves present staff with no one to check on status of requests.
2. I think communication to constituents is one of the weakest areas of the Board.
3. The Board needs more communication with state licensees. Use more social media avenues emails, etc.
4. I am not clear on how the Board communicates changes.
5. Not everyone checks their email. The email should have a quick blurb on the details of the regulations changed or amended in the subject line.
6. I do not recall ever getting notifications of changes; I have sought them out myself.
7. There are not enough "in person" meetings for interested parties to attend (Board meetings and Committee meetings).

Process

1. It takes way too long to make regulatory changes.
2. I think the process seems intimidating to licensees so they don't respond, participate or become active.

Other

1. Perhaps this is due to a state government weakness vs. the Board of Occupational Therapy weakness. However, a simple question by a colleague regarding assigning more PDUs for supervising a student resulted in it being assigned to an Ad Hoc Committee that will probably take months to a year to resolve. When OTs call the Board, I don't think we want to be asked to join an Ad Hoc Committee.
2. It is difficult to really participate in and follow telephone meetings.
3. I follow changes on California regulations, but many other licensees are not aware of changes.
4. There is a concern that with the changes in Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) standards, the Board will still have regulations that were put in place because of lack of education (advanced practice areas), causing over regulation.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Laws and Regulations Weaknesses

Caller Questions and Regulation Clean-up Suggestions

1. The Practice Act does not have any categories specific to practice questions, yet that is what most callers have questions about.
2. Licensees call the Board asking a lot of questions regarding specifics or scenarios that are unique to their workplace and they want help solving their problems. Staff can't answer many of the questions because they are not experts in regulations. Jeff and Heather are available to answer most of the questions because they have institutional knowledge; however, it takes up a lot of their time.
3. Many applicants do not know the regulations well and staff have to spend a lot of time on the phone guiding callers through the Web site to find information.
4. Regulations regarding continuing education could be clearer. Staff receive a lot of questions about online classes.
5. The Practice Act could use some clarifying regulations. Staff do not have any guidelines to help callers.
6. The Board gets a lot of phone and email questions about the Advanced Practice course list. Many callers complain that it is difficult to find courses that are approved on the list.
7. The Board does not have statutes that allow enforcement investigators to inspect records. This hinders some investigations.

Personnel

1. The Board has a vacancy whose duties include monitoring and developing laws and regulations. This is hindering the Board's ability to promote and enhance its regulatory mandate to protect California consumers and improve effectiveness.

Outreach

1. The Board could be better at notifying the public and licensees regarding actual regulation changes. Currently, the Board's only method is updating the Web site. We do not utilize email blasts, social media or mail-outs.
2. The Board needs a more effective way to communicate regulation changes to our stakeholders. Currently we send mail-outs to licensees and delinquents, but this is very expensive.

Board Member Comments Regarding Laws and Regulations Weaknesses

Educating Stakeholders

1. The Board could do a better job explaining the regulatory process to licensees.
2. The Board needs to better educate licensees on what it means to be a professional.

Meetings

1. The Board's committees do not meet regularly. For example: the Practice Committee has not met in years. This might be because of a shortage of resources and/or BreEZe taking so much time.
2. The Board is mandated to meet in Southern California, Bay Area and Sacramento at least once a year; however we could not find an affordable option in the Bay Area and could not meet there.

Regulation Development

1. The Board has taken years to develop a proposal to amend the definition of occupational therapy. Now the Board needs someone to sponsor the legislation, which has been a challenge.
2. The Board tends to be more reactive than proactive when it comes to legislation. It seems that we tend to follow legislation that could impact us, rather than move forward with our own.
3. It seems that we rehash discussions about legislation at every board meeting which can be repetitive and time consuming. We need a more efficient way of discussing updates.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Outreach and Communication Strengths

Presentations

1. The Board meets with students about licensing.
2. If an OT goes to any OTAC functions, he/she is able to approach a CBOT representative to ask questions.
3. At least on a one-on-one basis in a public setting, the Board seems very approachable.
4. When the Board is able to provide outreach, it does a fantastic job. Heather and Jeff do a great job at communicating with licensees and students about Board issues. They are especially good at making unfamiliar information easy to understand.

Electronic Communication

1. I receive some emails on topics.
2. I get emails occasionally about law and/or regulation amendments.

Personnel

1. Staff are very responsive and collaborative.

General

1. The Board is consistent and thorough with its external constituency communications related to Board meeting agendas and proposed revisions to regulations.
2. The communications have improved considerably.
3. The Board is effective in informing the public on the Board Web site of occupational therapy requirements.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Outreach and Communication Strengths

Web site Information and Updates

1. The Web site is accessible, the information is clear and people can get to it.
2. Disciplinary actions are posted on the Board Web site promptly.
3. The Web site updates are done within the timelines given by the EO and staff are held accountable to get things updated promptly.
4. Web site is updated regularly.

School Relationships and Presentations

1. When requested, the EO provides a detailed presentation for OT program graduates covering the following topics: licensure requirements, the application process, permits, an overview of the role and responsibilities of the Board, consumer protection core, and the complaint and disciplinary process.
2. The EO has a collaborative and cooperative relationship with program directors.
3. Board staff (EO) has been able to build personal relationships with licensees through direct outreach at schools and through presentations.

Other Outreach Methods

1. The Board views communication with the public as a high priority. Therefore, Web site updates and mailings are always done promptly.
2. The Board recently updated their interested parties list and moved over to the Listserv program.
3. The Board has a Facebook page with over 1,000 likes.
4. In the past, the Board has had a booth at the state fair.

Board Member Comments Regarding Outreach and Communication Strengths

Web site

1. The Board Web site is pretty good.
2. The Board is much more aggressive with the Web site and communicating with licensees through the Web site.

Conferences

1. The Board is an exhibiter at the state conference sponsored by the Occupational Therapy Association of California (OTAC).
2. The Board partnered with the OTAC to present at the conference last spring. The presidents from both organizations presented and it was well attended and well received.
3. Board members attend conferences and represent the Board well. They report on their events at Board meetings.

Association Relationships

1. The relationship with professional associations is good, even though they have a minority membership compared to the licensed population.

Other

1. During Board meetings we discuss outreach regularly and brainstorm how we can do more.
2. The Board's attempts to meet in different areas of the state so that more people can attend.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Outreach and Communication Weaknesses

Evidence-Based Practices

1. This is the first communication I've received in a long time, and it concerns me that CBOT is reporting about evidence-based practices. I didn't realize you had researchers with the Board who are evaluating evidence-based practices, and trends. I thought the scope of the Board was licensing, regulatory and disciplinary function, not teaching us how to practice.
2. There is no place on the Web site where evidence-based practice is discussed other than the link to AOTA. There is no real discussion of standards and trends.
3. Rarely do I receive anything with evidence-based practice or trends.

Green Communication

1. The Board needs more electronic avenues to communicate.
2. I think this is the Board's weakest area. Perhaps every licensee could be subscribed to the Board's newsletter. Each licensee could then decide to unsubscribe to the newsletter. Another option could be that when applicants' and licensees' renewals occur, an option to sign up for CBOT's electronic newsletters and/or email alerts could be as simple as a check box on the form.
3. Until recently I never received any green communication with the Board either at my work place or as part of the community.

Budget

1. I think budget limitations hinder the Board's ability to do more outreach.
2. The Board is certainly constrained by budget issues. Outreach is very limited due to travel constraints imposed by the state.

Other

1. Nothing is sent to all practicing OTs about Board meetings in our region so we can attend; I had previously received notice of upcoming meetings in San Diego, but no longer receive this; I also think that once or twice yearly a summary update could be sent out as a mass e-mail.
2. It is not clear what the mechanism of outreach is.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Outreach and Communication Weaknesses

Lack of Comprehensive Method to Inform Licensees

1. The Listserv is not substantial enough to be of any value.
2. The Board does not have a comprehensive way of contacting licensees because we do not collect licensee email addresses.
3. Occupational Therapy professional organizations do not have a substantial membership; therefore do not provide any value in partnering with the Board for outreach.

Lack of Specific Types of Outreach

1. There has not been enough outreach to new graduates regarding limited permits.
2. There has not been enough outreach regarding the role and responsibilities of the Board.
3. The Board does not have the resources to produce a newsletter for licensees.

Other

1. The burden of the school presentations is on the EO, Board members and staff should be trained on how to do this as well.
2. Travel restrictions have had an adverse effect on the Board in how we communicate with students and licensees who need a lot of education regarding regulation interpretation.

Board Member Comments Regarding Outreach and Communication Weaknesses

Web site

1. The Web site could be better.
2. The Web site is not organized in a logical way.
3. The "quick hits" on the Web site are disorganized and unclear.
4. Some things on the Web site are not up-to-date, such as the committee structure.
5. Most OTs do not look at the Web site, so the Board needs to get people to be more proactive.

Lack of Alternative Outreach Methods

1. The Board has not done all we could do when it comes to outreach, especially in terms of green methods.
2. Green communication methods are non-existent.
3. The Board does not talk about evidence-based practices at all in terms of outreach.
4. The Board could use the Occupational Therapy Association of California as a resource to publish information.
5. The Board does not produce a newsletter.

Board Members Role

1. Board members could take on some more work when it comes to outreach, specifically the Web site, like posting updates.
2. Staff could ask Board members for help!

General

1. Outreach is a big area for improvement.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Organizational Effectiveness Strengths

Responsiveness of Staff

1. The staff is very responsive and collaborative.
2. I feel the Board staff members are very responsive to licensees and consumers within the constraints imposed by the state (budget/staff issues and BreEZe taking up so much staff time). Calls and emails are returned timely, and staff is very pleasant when responding to these inquiries.
3. They are always timely and willing to listen.

Other

1. Board members are volunteers, who have limited available time. I think they are a very dedicated and thoughtful Board.
2. As a professional organization we always find them as a good resource and cooperative.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Organizational Effectiveness Strengths

Executive Officer

1. The EO gets the work done with a no-nonsense attitude and leadership style.
2. The EO has an outcome-based leadership style with a laser beam focus.
3. The EO has employees' best interests in mind. She protects staff by setting realistic expectations to get work done.
4. The entire staff follows the EO's direction well.
5. The EO is Superwoman. She does everything in this office! Especially with limited resources and not enough people.
6. Staff feel confident that the EO will get things done if she puts her mind to it.
7. Any time the Board gives direction to the EO, whether it is a suggestion or direction, staff gets it done promptly and accurately.

Phone and Window Coverage

1. The staff does an awesome job in answering phones and ensuring phone coverage on breaks and vacations.
2. Even the EO will help answering phones if staff is out and there is no coverage.
3. Phones are always answered between 8 am and 5 pm.
4. Someone is always available to help at the public counter.

Management

1. Management encourages professional development by allowing crossed training.
2. Management encourages staff to take ownership of tasks and duties and wants us to take responsibility.
3. Staff are willing to take initiative.
4. Management treats staff as professionals, they do not micro-manage staff because they trust us.
5. Managers are always well informed.

Cross Training

1. Everyone in the office is cross-trained so renewals, initial applications and basic questions can be answered by anyone.
2. Everyone has access to CAS[3], so we can all change addresses and handle most faxes and emails.
3. When people are out on leave or vacation, the work is picked up by other people, so the work does not pile up.
4. Staff work as a team, help each other out and are crossed-trained.
5. Each staff member is not limited to only their desks, which helps with employee engagement.

[3] Consumer Affairs System (CAS) is the Board's legacy enforcement tracking system.

6. The Board does not feel the effect of being short staffed; it still functions at high level.

Team Oriented

1. The entire staff works well with each other as a team and ensures that everything is done before the day is over.
2. Staff are stepping up to complete workload that has been left behind with current vacancies.
3. Staff pitch in for people who are off to make sure things are done.
4. Heather and Jeff encourage Board staff attend Board meetings, as a learning opportunity to get to know Board members and to build relationships with them.
5. Staff all communicate well.

Board Members

1. Board members have best intent and are very participatory, engaged and interested.
2. The Board membership is balanced well with both professional and public members who work well together and are knowledgeable.

Other

1. BreEZe will be a great upgrade for both staff and applicants. Board staff will not have to rely on an Excel spreadsheet as a substitute for the Application Tracking System (ATS) the rest of DCA uses.

Board Member Comments Regarding Organizational Effectiveness Strengths

Executive Officer

1. The Board has an Executive Officer (EO).
2. The EO is trustworthy and manages the staff well.
3. The EO is very knowledgeable and is a huge resource of information.
4. The Board has the best EO in DCA. She is the most effective, most in tune with staff and supportive of staff.
5. The Board has an amazing EO!
6. Staff will go the extra mile for the EO.
7. The EO is organized and moves through cases in a timely manner.
8. The EO is efficient with a limited budget and resources.
9. The EO has a lot of historical knowledge.

Personnel

1. Staff have been great and have improved in last year, especially in their responsiveness and service to the Board members in helping with travel arrangements.

Board Meetings

1. The Board is able to make decisions at meetings in a harmonious way.
2. We have public participation at Board meetings.
3. The Board has made good use of telecommunications if members cannot make a meeting in person.

General

1. I believe that the Board is the best organizational operation in DCA.
2. The Board and staff cooperate well together.
3. Board members are very knowledgeable of both the function of the Board and the industry.

Stakeholder Comments Regarding Organizational Effectiveness Weaknesses

Timeliness of Email and Phone Responses

1. We receive a lot of feedback that the staff is slow to respond and that processes seem over cumbersome or that don't make sense. The staff can only do what they can do in terms of managing a large workload.
2. Emails to the Board often take a long time to get a response and require multiple follow ups.
3. I emailed an inquiry which was never answered. I called and the staff member did not seem very pleasant in her responses. I needed a signature to verify that I held an OT license in order to obtain a new state license and the process was held up because the Board takes 10-14 days to process this request. It really takes 10-14 days to sign a paper which I mailed to them and then mail it to the appropriate party?
4. Prior to serving on the Ad Hoc Committee, I had made several email attempts and phone calls that were never returned.

Other

5. Constraints imposed by the state (budget/staffing/BreEZe taking up so much staff time).
6. The Board needs to improve internal communication that would help improve external communication.

Board Staff Comments Regarding Organizational Effectiveness Weaknesses

BreEZe Impact

1. BreEZe will impact the wait times on the phones from people calling in and making requests. Things that would be done quickly will take longer now. People will probably complain that we are taking too long on simple procedures.
2. BreEZe is overwhelming and time consuming for staff.

Board Member Comments Regarding Organizational Effectiveness Weaknesses

BreEZe Impact

1. The BreEZe project is time consuming.
2. The BreEZe project and vacancies, which are both out of staff's control, have affected processes and timeframes.

Executive Officer

1. Board members do not give as much direction to Heather as they could.
2. The EO does not delegate enough; she can get overwhelmed with details.
3. The Board has not documented the EO's institutional knowledge and would suffer greatly if she were to leave.

Logistical

1. The Board's legal counsel has changed several times over the last few years which has caused a lack of consistency.
2. There have been a few miscommunications regarding logistical meeting times that were not correctly posted online.
3. Travel arrangements are not always concrete and easy. There has been some confusion between Board members and staff regarding car rentals.

Appendix B: Major Trends and Changes

This appendix contains the qualitative data relating to trends affecting the Board collected during the survey, focus group and interviews.

The comments in this appendix are shown as provided by stakeholders. Comments that appear similar or on a specific topic have been organized into categories. The comments have not been edited for grammar or punctuation in order to preserve the accuracy, feeling and/or meaning the stakeholder intended when providing the comment.

There are many factors that may impact the future direction of the Occupational Therapy profession. These trends and/or changes could be opportunities the Board may want to capitalize on or threats that the Board may want to try to mitigate.

External stakeholders, Board members and Board staff were asked to list potential changes or trends outside of the Board that they felt could impact the profession and the Board's regulatory role. The following pages are categorized by common concerns.

Educational Standards

Advanced Practice

1. There is a debate over advanced practice (three specialized areas that require additional certification). Some perceive it as over-regulating the profession.
2. Advance practice certification gives little support and is taking way too long.
3. There is lots of confusion about advanced practice and concern over the continued need for it.
4. ACOTE requires that areas of advanced practice are now part of entry level OT education.
5. For Master's students of OT, educational standards are regulated by ACOTE. For hand therapy, swallowing and modalities, now that ACOTE standards cover training, shouldn't it be time to reconsider the requirements for people who graduated under the new standards to require additional training?

Entry-level Requirement Change

1. There is some discussion at the national level to change the entry level education requirement from a Bachelor's degree to a Ph.D. This would affect the Board directly because it could limit access to care by limiting the number of applicants and licensees.
2. If the entry level requirements were to change to a Ph.D., there would be a significant gap between the OT and the OTA.
3. How will the Board regulate changes in educational standards? I.e. OT Doctorate (OTD) as entry level and OTA as a two year program?
4. There could be a possible movement to a doctoral level for OT and bachelor level for OTA.
5. As a proactive measure, discuss a possible entry-level doctorate and how that would impact state requirements.
6. As a proactive measure, discuss a possible entry-level baccalaureate degree for occupational therapy assistants and how this would impact state requirements.
7. Right now I am concerned that with the entry level of education being at the Masters level, what is happening with those of us who are long practicing (more than 30 years) with a Bachelor's degree. Can we be grandfathered in? Or will we soon be required to retire?
8. AOTA's Board of Directors has called for a profession-wide move to entry-level doctorate. Increasing numbers of occupational therapy programs are moving to this level. Graduates need to know and understand the legal parameters of calling themselves "doctor," advertising their practices, signing their names, etc.
9. Look at raising the entrance degree for the COTA from an Associate Degree to a Bachelor's Degree.
10. Move toward doctor of OT requirements.
11. I see need for more skilled COTA level in some settings. We likely miss some excellent mature individuals who would never commit to masters or doctorate level but who could do well with a two year program. Always have to be diligent about abuse by administrators, giving these people duties beyond their training and competency levels.
12. OT should not progress from masters to a doctorate. The marginal increase in pay will not substantiate the student loan debt.

13. Start looking at how moving to an entry-level doctorate policy would affect California.

Other

1. Why doesn't ACOTE enforce its own standard of OT educators being licensed?
2. Can the Board continue to work with ACOTE on this issue, and/or monitor educators in California more closely?
3. There needs to be clarity on the continuing education standards. Simplify the PDU's vs. CEUs vs. CE requirements.
4. I wish there was more of a program online to keep track of CEUs.
5. Changing ACOTE standards may affect preparation in the areas of physical agent modalities but this will not affect the preparation of those already licensed. However, in most other states OTs, covered by their general license ethics are practicing in all of our advanced practice areas without undo problems to the public.
6. The role of occupational therapy in the role of primary care and direct access will need to be defined by the Board and through regulations.
7. There is always a discussion about increasing the fieldwork requirements and potentially requiring continuing education credits for renewals.
8. One of the graduation requirements is that candidates complete a set number of fieldwork hours. Schools are increasingly challenged to find enough placements in OT offices for their candidates. Some candidates have to travel extreme distances or even leave the state to complete this requirement. The Board should take a more active role in assisting schools with their placements.
9. Could there be credentialing for OTs in the schools?
10. Integrate educational standards as they become required by the accreditation agency.

Economy/Business/Employment Opportunities

1. There are not enough OTs to meet the needs in some communities. There is a shortage in schools, pediatrics and elderly homes.
2. The Board has not done a workforce study so we do not know what our workforce looks like.
3. Many new programs are opening in the same area, which results in difficulty with fieldwork placements and could possibly saturate the market.
4. Need to continue to encourage practitioners to expand their engagement in various fields related to occupation.
5. More OTs are getting into primary care and community based programs, which is a great trend.

Emerging National or State Policy Development

1. It appears that state lobbyists and state legislative representatives of AOTA do not interact much with the Board. (I.e. rehabilitation trends)
2. Continuing competency (New NBCOT Navigator - online continuing competency tools).
3. How can state regulatory entities and NBCOT collaboratively work toward enhanced continuing competency?

4. Consider the NBCOT initiative to serve as an Authorized Agent for disciplinary action reporting purposes to the National Practitioner Databank.
5. It is important to be involved with NBCOT.
6. Nationally, there is a move towards population health.

Technology/Service Delivery

1. Telehealth, which is healthcare advice over the phone, Skype etc. is a hot topic in the profession. The Board has developed regulations regarding this already and is in the process of refining them.
2. A benefit of telehealth is the increase in access to the public. The risk is that the quality is not there. The jury is still out on whether telehealth benefits outweigh the risks.
3. The Practice Committee needs to address the multiple locations of where OTs practice (primary schools, nursing homes). Need to address their needs and be informed about what trends they are seeing and address them.
4. The OT role in technology will need to be defined by the Board and through regulations.
5. How do we regulate OTs in emerging areas or non-traditional practice fields? (Wellness, technology, telemedicine, advanced practice, hospital care).
6. What are the specific areas in technology both emerging and advanced practice that will affect how the Board regulates?
7. We need to ensure continual delivery of products and services in the most efficient way possible through online enhancements.
8. The Board needs to stay up-to-date on telehealth.
9. Focus should shift to prevention, especially in our aging population.

Laws and Regulations

1. Recognizing the primary role of the state regulatory board, continued general awareness of the ACA and implications for healthcare including occupational therapy practice.
2. There is no language in OTs practice laws and regulations about referring to oneself as a "doctor." Please refer to the following two codes: the Business and Professions Code, Section 2054a (California State Legislature, n.d.) for physicians and surgeons and the Business and Professions Code, Section 2633 (California State Legislature, n.d.) for physical therapists. Need to promulgate some regulations on how OTDs are referred to, and include the initials OTD as an acceptable way to sign one's name as an OT.

Other

1. The athletic trainers association does not have a regulatory entity. There was legislation to see if they could be included in BOT. This could be an opportunity for BOT to expand reach, mission and mandate.

Appendix C: Glossary of Terms

Acronym	Definition
ACA	Affordable Care Act
ACOTE	Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education
AOTA	American Occupational Therapy Association
BOT	Board of Occupational Therapy
CAS	Consumer Affairs System
CBOT	California Board of Occupational Therapy
CE	Continuing Education
CEU	Continuing Education Unit
COTA	Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant
DOI	Department of Consumer Affairs' Division of Investigations
EO	Executive Officer
NBCOT	National Board of Certification in Occupational Therapy
OT	Occupational Therapy/ Occupational Therapist
OTA	Occupational Therapy Assistant
OTAC	Occupational Therapy Association of California
OTD	Doctorate of Occupational Therapy
PDU	Professional Development Unit

Appendix D: Data Collection Method

Information for this survey was gathered by surveying external stakeholders, Board members and Board staff using the following methods:

- Interviews conducted with 5 of the 6 members of the Board completed during the month of May 2015 to assess the challenges and opportunities the Board is currently facing or will face in the upcoming years.
- Interviews conducted with each Board staff member, including the Executive Officer, in May 2015 to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Board from an internal perspective. Six Board staff participated.
- An online survey sent to about 900 randomly selected external Board stakeholders in May 2015 to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Board from an external perspective. Sixty-three stakeholders completed the survey. The below table shows how stakeholders identified themselves in the online survey.

Stakeholders Breakdown	Number	% of Total
Professional licensee	47	77%
Retired licensee	0	0.0%
Consumer/member of the public	3	4.9%
Professional organization representative	2	3.3%
Program Director or faculty member at a college or university	4	6.6%
Student in OT or OTA program, preparing for licensure	0	0.0%
Other	5	8.2%
TOTAL:	61	100%

Appendix E: Stakeholder Survey Representation

SOLID was interested in knowing more about those who participated in the online stakeholder survey. SOLID believes that the information below is important to collect in order to create a frame of reference for the data in this document.

The questions and responses are listed below:

When was the last time you interacted with the Board of Occupational Therapy?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0 - 4 months ago	44.3%	27
5-12 months ago	29.5%	18
Over a year ago	18.0%	11
More than two years ago	8.2%	5

Which statement best describes your most recent interaction with the Board of Occupational Therapy?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
General inquiry by email, phone or fax.	31.1%	19
Initial licensure application.	0.0%	0
Renewal licensure application.	42.6%	26
I was subject of an enforcement-related issue.	0.0%	0
I submitted an enforcement-related issue.	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)	26.2%	16

Appendix F: Survey Data Reliability

Based on forty-seven licensees who responded to the electronic survey, we can be 95% confident their opinions represent most California licensed Occupational Therapists plus or minus six percent, in many cases. For example, 90% of licensees rated the Board's overall applicant qualifications effectiveness as good or excellent. Based on our response rate, we can be 95% confident between 84% and 96% of licensees would rate the Board's effectiveness the same way.[4]

To help improve data integrity, the online survey did not provide a neutral option when asking about overall effectiveness. Instead, stakeholders completing the survey chose between a positive choice (excellent or good) and a negative choice (poor or very poor). This allows the Board to better understand whether stakeholders have a positive or negative view of the Board in various areas.

Notes

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[4] Source: University of Connecticut sample size calculator www.gifted.uconn.edu/siegle/research/samples/samplecalculator.htm

solid
planning solutions

SOLID Planning Solutions is dedicated to your continual improvement and organization development.
We offer a wide array of services and programs to Boards, Boards and divisions.

Strategic Planning • Process Improvement • Planning Sessions • Meeting Facilitation
Contact us to learn more about how we can help your organization achieve a successful future.
916-574-8316 • SOLID@dca.ca.gov