COTE Coding Sheet

1. Identifying Information

Reviewer: _____________________________

Type:  □ AJOT: Brief Report (Refereed)  □ Book  □ Refereed Editorial
       □ AJOT: Firm Persuasion  □ Dissertation  □ Refereed Feature-length Journal article
       □ AJOT: The Foundation  □ Non-peer reviewed article  □ Report
       □ AJOT: Issue Is (Refereed)  □ Official publication

Citation Information:
Authors: _____________________________________________ Year ____________
Title: ______________________________________________________
Publication: _________________________________________ Vol;Issue;Pages ____________
Country:  □ US  □ International

Search Method:
□ Electronic search  □ Hand search
□ Recommendation (verbal)  □ Citation

2. Overall Purpose

a. Aim of paper or research study (Rule: (a) if it is a research article, mark aim as “stated” only if the aim is explicitly stated – though statement of aim or purpose can be general; (b) check “stated” if authors describe what the paper will accomplish).

   □ Stated  □ Unstated

b. Focus of Paper or Research

□ Undergraduate
□ Graduate
□ Unclear
□ Level I
□ Level II
□ OT
□ OTA
□ Community
□ Hospital/Med Model
□ Mental Health
□ Emerging Practice
□ Alternative Models (supervision, population, setting...)
□ Other

________________________________________________________________________________________________________
3. **Educational Content (select all that apply)**

To provide a conceptual context of study, please check the educational descriptors for each of the following categories. Include MAJOR areas of study in the focus, methods, findings, or discussion sections. (Rule: (a) For all items in section three, if any specific content area is checked, then “yes” must also be checked in the “addressed” question).
a. What is this reference primarily about? Choose one. (Rules: (a) Primarily Curriculum if the paper specifically describes and/or studies a particular approach to: curriculum, course design, course sequence, curriculum philosophy. These papers may include the use of student evaluations of the curriculum as a source of program evaluation or validation. Check “no” if understanding students’ perspectives of a curriculum are the reason the study was conducted (rate as primarily about students—student perspectives). Check “no” if the paper simply has implications for curriculum at the end. (b) Primarily Physical if the paper is a study of a learning environment, or a comparison of learning environments, including moving from face-to-face to online or comparing F2F to online, describing virtual teaching tools, or describing how teaching needed to change to accommodate online learning. (c) Primarily Student – If the paper includes both student and teaching elements, and the focus of the paper is unclear, differentiate from Primarily Teaching by the emphasis given in the abstract and/or title. (d) Primarily Assessment/Addresses Assessment=Must be about how best to assess students’ knowledge, skills and competence. Check “no” if the paper describes, or even assesses, students’ knowledge skills and competence, but does not focus on how best to assess learning. Must go beyond the fact that knowledge, skills, competencies were assessed in the paper. (e) Primarily Teaching if the paper foregrounds the teaching/learning process; also if paper uses the term “curriculum design” and is focused on “curriculum changes” that are primarily about teaching techniques. (f) Primarily Faculty if the paper states one of the subcategories as its primary focus. Check “no” if the paper has implications for, or seems relevant to, faculty issues but they are not identified by the author.)

☐ Curriculum design/operations / administration
☐ Physical setting
☐ Student learning, student perspectives, or student outcomes
☐ Assessment
☐ Teaching methods
☐ Faculty issues

b. Curriculum design/operations / administration (Rules: (a) “Curriculum” is defined broadly, as a “total blueprint for learning” to encompass a wide range of authors’ views about the meaning of curriculum, e.g., from design of a single course to comprehensive curriculum development processes across courses. (b) Curriculum can be addressed exclusively in the literature review. (c) Say “no” if it addresses other types of program administration such as faculty evaluation)

i. Does this reference address curriculum operations / administration?
☐ Yes ☐ No

ii. Does this paper convey a particular view of the meaning of “curriculum”?
☐ Yes ☐ No

iii. Areas of curriculum addressed (select all that apply) (Rule: (a) “Curriculum content” may be checked if the authors focus on just one topic that they believe curriculum ought to include/OT educators ought to teach. (b) FW is the equivalent of a course. (c) For FW articles check curriculum design only if authors describe connections between FW and overall curriculum. (d) FW design includes different structures or models for FW)

☐ Course/Workshop/FW design ☐ Outcome predictors
☐ Curriculum Content ☐ Retention
☐ Curriculum Design ☐ Meeting ACOTE Standards
☐ Other ☐ Other
c. Physical setting

i. Does this reference address the physical setting? □ Yes □ No
(Rule: (a) Code “yes” only if the setting is explicitly described, related to and deemed critical to the teaching methods or issues that are under study; (b) to merit a code “yes” the FW site must be described and relevance to the study, FW structure, or program description must be explicated; (c) Code “no” if the setting is simply where participants were recruited; (d) that the learning takes place in a FW site that is offsite from the academic program is insufficient-code “no” if the article does not describe the specific setting’s relevance or compare settings or link learning to that setting.

ii. Physical Settings Addressed (select all that apply)
   - □ Ambulatory care
   - □ Classroom
   - □ Clinical experience
   - □ Community
   - □ Distance learning
   - □ Laboratory
   - □ Teaching hospital
   - □ Training center
   - □ Other _____________

---
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d. Student Focus
(Rules: (a) This section relates to the intended or expected learning outcomes for the educational intervention or educational approach, which differs from impact in Section 6; (b) Students are defined to include non-OT students; (c) Include content areas identified in text, figures and tables; and (d) Do NOT assume a content/area of student learning if it is not identified or clearly suggested by the authors.

i. Does this reference address student learning, student perspectives, or student outcomes? □ Yes □ No

ii. Areas of Student Learning Addressed (select all that apply)
(Rules: (a) “Student outcomes” refer to variables/measures that predict future performance as practitioners and/or impacts at a practice level. (b) “Student perspectives” should not be checked only on the fact that a tool/measure employs an emic perspective in which students evaluated themselves or conveyed self-perceptions. Rather, the article/manuscript must have a central focus on the perspectives of students, e.g., students’ attitudes toward people with disabilities or students’ beliefs about evidence-based practice.

   - □ Appropriate attitudes
   - □ Appropriate clinical reasoning
   - □ Client assessment
   - □ Client management
   - □ Client safety / reducing errors
   - □ Clinical skills
   - □ Communication skills
   - □ Critical thinking/ problem solving
   - □ EBP information seeking
   - □ Effective teamwork

   □ Health promotion
   □ Personal devpmt /prof. behavior
   □ Practice procedures
   □ Role of health professional
   □ Student knowledge:
   □ Understanding basic/clinical sciences
   □ Student knowledge: Other
   □ Student outcomes
   □ Student perspectives

Please indicate specific skill: ________________________________________________________________
e. **Assessment** (Rules: (a) By definition, “assessment” can target individuals and groups; (b) Code “yes” when the article refers to a method or tool used to measure learning or performance; (c) “yes” if reference indicates how learning was assessed on FW or in a course/learning activity.; (d) “no” when assessment is discussed solely in the context of documenting change for research. NOTE: More restrictive definition applies to Is This Reference Primary About Assessment?

f. **Does this reference address assessment?** ☐ Yes ☐ No

i. **If yes, then how is learning assessed? (select all that apply)**

- [ ] Feedback – verbal
- [ ] Feedback – written
- [ ] FW Assessment tool
- [ ] Observation
- [ ] Practical exam
- [ ] Written product
- [ ] Portfolio
- [ ] Other ______
- [ ] Self-Assessment

---

**Teaching Methods**

i. **Does this reference address teaching methods?** ☐ Yes ☐ No

ii. **Teaching Methods Addressed (select all that apply)** (Rule: (a) Check “yes” only if the teaching method is identified by the author(s). (b) Note the teaching method that is at the macro/big picture level, e.g., while PBL involves cases and typically teamwork, only PBL should be checked as it is distinct from case-based learning and cooperative learning. (c) For FW, check “yes” if authors indicate HOW learning is facilitated; check “no” if only the structure or FW model is described—code that under “curriculum—FW Design”)

- [ ] Case-based learning (video/paper)
- [ ] Community-based learning, Emerging Practice
- [ ] Cooperative learning
- [ ] Experiential/active learning
- [ ] Interprof. Ed. (IPE)
- [ ] Lecture-based learning
- [ ] Mentoring
- [ ] Occupation-centered learning
- [ ] Problem based learning
- [ ] Self-directed learning
- [ ] Service learning
- [ ] Teaching styles/skills
- [ ] Other

---
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h. Faculty Issues (Rule: (a) faculty are defined broadly (e.g. PBL tutors, clinicians who teach academic programs, Fieldwork Educators, and Academic Fieldwork Coordinators))

i. Does this reference address faculty issues?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

ii. Faculty Issues Addressed (select all that apply)

☐ AFWC Role
☐ Faculty challenges: shortages
☐ Faculty challenges: other
☐ Faculty challenges: workplace demands
☐ Faculty development
☐ Morale/job satisfaction

Focus on program directors
Perceptions/attitudes
Thinking skills
OTHER

Describe Other Issues:
4. Research Determination
Is this a research reference? □ Yes □ No (Rule: (a) Is this formatted as a research article, with defined Methods, Results, and a systematic research approach? (b) If the reference is not research, then answer “a” below and skip to the bottom of the form, “Overall Impression of Article”; (b) if the reference is research, then proceed to Section 5, “Research-specific Coding.”)

a. Sources of argument

☐ Author’s expert opinion
☐ Author’s direct experience
☐ Literature
☐ Other

Describe other sources:

5. Research-specific Coding

a. Research Type (select all that apply)

(Rule: Check “no” if authors mention that they collected data, but they do not analyze or report it in the current paper; data not reported in this particular paper should not be considered to be a part of the current study when deciding whether the study has a qualitative or quantitative component.)

i. Qualitative Studies □ Yes □ No (Rule: (a) Check “yes” if qualitative is predominant method identified by the authors. If a quantitative aspect is secondary, then also check “Mixed Method.”)

☐ Audit / Program evaluation
☐ Action-based
☐ Biography
☐ Case Study
☐ Ethnography

☐ Grounded theory
☐ Historical
☐ Narrative
☐ Phenomenology
☐ UNCLEAR

ii. Quantitative Studies □ Yes □ No (Rule: (a) Check “yes” if quantitative is predominant method identified by the authors. If a qualitative aspect is secondary, then also check “Mixed Method”)

☐ Cross-sectional
☐ Single case design
☐ Multiple case design
☐ Single Group/ cohort
☐ Multiple Groups
☐ Survey Research

☐ Control Trials
☐ Non-randomized
☐ Randomized

☐ Single assessment
☐ Pre & post assessment
☐ Time series

☐ Prospective
☐ Retrospective

iii. Mixed Methods □ Yes □ No (Rule: (a) Check “yes” if authors state as selected method; (b) Check “yes” if quantitative and qualitative are used equally; OR (c) Check “yes” if quantitative or qualitative is a secondary type)

iv. Systematic Review □ Yes □ No

If the above category is checked, further define the approach used
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v. Meta Analysis □ Yes □ No

b. Research question (Rule: (a) if there is not a question mark, then say “unstated”; and b) do not assume a research question from the purpose of the study.

□ Stated □ Unstated

c. Research hypothesis

□ Stated □ Unstated □ N/A

d. Research participants

i. Country / Location / Context of study

ii. Number of Subjects / Size of Group (Rule: (a) for surveys, include response rate if known)

iii. Profession

□ Occupational Therapy □ Medical
□ OTA □ Nursing
□ Physical Therapy □ Pharmacy
□ Speech Language Therapy □ Other

e. Data collection (select all that apply)

i. Collection methods or sources of argument

□ Class assignment □ MCQ exam
□ Custom assessment □ Observation
□ Custom survey/ Likert/ questionnaire □ Student outcome data
□ Data from simulator/ simulation □ Tool/measure that is non-validated but published
□ Focus group □ Tool/measure with established psychometric properties
□ Interview □ Other: ______________________________________
ii. Duration of exposure of subjects to intervention

- One time
- One Semester course
- Intensive short course
- Multiple semester courses
- Thread across curriculum
- No intervention

iii. Researcher engagement

(Rule: (a) Researcher engagement applies only to qualitative studies or to qualitative component of mixed methods studies. Therefore, check NA for quantitative studies. Engagement refers to direct face-to-face encounter between researcher and participants or time onsite. It refers to time spent in data collection, but not in member checking.)

- Single encounter
- Less than one month
- NA
- Less than one week
- Less than three months
- No engagement
- Less than two weeks
- Three or more months
- UNKNOWN

f. Level of Investigation / Impact: Modified Kirkpatrick Hierarchy

Code the level of impact being studied or described in the item and/or summarize any results of the intervention at the appropriate level. Note: include both predetermined and unintended outcomes.

i. Does this study involve any educational intervention or innovation?

- Yes
- No

(Rule: (a) Check “yes” if a teaching method, learning experience, course, or program has been designed to effect specific and identified outcomes and is being evaluated according to those outcomes. (b) If reference does not involve intervention or innovation, proceed to “g”, strength of findings. (c) For coding levels below, consider the author’s INTENT and PERSPECTIVE - NOT actual documented IMPACT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Attitudes / perceptions</th>
<th>Knowledge / skills</th>
<th>Behavioral change</th>
<th>Change in organizational practice</th>
<th>Benefits to patient / clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2a</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Attitudes / perceptions</th>
<th>Knowledge / skills</th>
<th>Behavioral change</th>
<th>Change in organizational practice</th>
<th>Benefits to patient / clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2b</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Attitudes / perceptions</th>
<th>Knowledge / skills</th>
<th>Behavioral change</th>
<th>Change in organizational practice</th>
<th>Benefits to patient / clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Attitudes / perceptions</th>
<th>Knowledge / skills</th>
<th>Behavioral change</th>
<th>Change in organizational practice</th>
<th>Benefits to patient / clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4a</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Attitudes / perceptions</th>
<th>Knowledge / skills</th>
<th>Behavioral change</th>
<th>Change in organizational practice</th>
<th>Benefits to patient / clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4b</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Attitudes / perceptions</th>
<th>Knowledge / skills</th>
<th>Behavioral change</th>
<th>Change in organizational practice</th>
<th>Benefits to patient / clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. **Strength of Findings** (Rules: (a) defined as internal validity for quantitative studies and trustworthiness for qualitative studies (b) to be rated “High”, study must have clearly explicated its analytical methods and demonstrated strong internal validity/trustworthiness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low=SERIOUS problems with internal validity/trustworthiness. Significant incongruence between purpose, conceptual framework, methods, results, conclusions. Limited or missing or unclear details on recruiting, participants, data collection and/or analysis.

Medium=Only MINOR problems with internal validity/trustworthiness. MINOR incongruence between purpose, conceptual framework, methods, results, conclusions. Sufficient details on recruiting, participants, data collection and/or analysis.

High=NO problems noted with any of the above. High Bar & Rare.

i. **Rate Methods /Congruence**

1. Conceptual framework is clearly developed ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
2. Conceptual framework is congruent with research aim/questions/hypothesis and methods ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
3. Congruence between purpose, evidence, argument, and conclusion ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
4. Appropriateness of study/review design (Rule: (a) consider if there was appropriate use of parametric and nonparametric data) ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
5. Implementation of study/review design ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
6. Appropriateness of data analysis ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

**Comment on evaluation methods, if applicable:**

____________________________________________________________________________________

h. **Documented Changes in Learning / Performance**

Did the article provide documentation for changes in learning / performance? ☐ Yes ☐ No (Rules: (a) To check “yes”, Changes must be documented through quantitative measures and/or highly trustworthy qualitative analyses; and (b) documented changes are inclusive of research approaches in which participants engage in self-evaluation; and (c) If no, then proceed to Section 6, Overall Impression of Article)

Version: 10 Oct 2011
i. **Areas of documented improvement in learning/performance (select all that apply)**

- [ ] Cognitive knowledge and Skills as demonstrated in:
  - [ ] Simulation
  - [ ] Real patient environment
  - [ ] Hands-on psychomotor skills
  - [ ] Management decision skills
  - [ ] High-level communication skills
- [ ] Attitude, where appropriate
- [ ] Other:

---
6. Overall Impression of Article
(Please make any additional comments regarding the overall strengths and weaknesses of the article)
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

7. Integration into Systematic Review: Emerging themes
(Please make any comments regarding how anything you found in this reference integrates with other references in this systematic review – emerging themes, coding ideas, additional searches, etc.)
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________