Haru Hirama's article, "The Issue Is—Should certified occupational therapy assistants provide services independently?" (1994) takes a few statements out of context, does not give a complete story of the issue, and, as a result, misguides the population it intends to inform.

Although I used the words "certified occupational therapists" to describe the certified occupational therapy assistant in my first editorial (Clark, 1993a, p. 4), I did not recommend, then or in my later editorial (Clark, 1993b), changing the name of Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant to Certified Occupational Therapist, as stated by Hirama (1994). I used these words because the term therapist is used to refer to both registered occupational therapists and certified occupational therapy assistants in several textbooks (Early, 1993; Ryan, 1993). Additionally, I wanted to emphasize that the latter are also "certified occupational therapy practitioners" (American Occupational Therapy Association [AOTA], 1994, p. 1039) to illustrate the point that the occupational therapy community was neglecting a potential resource in combating the erosion of job losses to the so-called professions of recreational therapy, activities therapy, and any other therapy that imitates occupational therapy. Certified occupational therapy assistants are becoming increasingly frustrated by so-called activities therapists who administer, without supervision by occupational therapists, the exact modalities that occupational therapists administer and that certified occupational therapy assistants are better trained to administer. Certified occupational therapy assistants have been prohibited from administering these modalities because of supervision requirements (Janulis, 1994; Oliver, 1993). The point of my editorial was not to end supervision requirements.

I also indicated that the military has successfully used the term technician for their assistant occupational therapists and physical therapists for many years. Janulis (1994) also observed that the dictionary definition of aide was "assistant." Even some occupational therapists address our assistants as aides. In an article discussing the Occupational Therapy-Physical Therapy Task Force on Modalities, Stephens (1994) stated, "I do think we should move in the direction of cross-training aides" (p. 4).

Contrary to Hirama (1994), numerous certified occupational therapy assistants and occupational therapists have suggested appropriate changes for the title of Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant. Hasbrouck (1994) and the 846 respondents to a survey conducted by the editorial staff members of ADVANCE for Occupational Therapists (Brown, 1994) suggested the term associate; both E. Nelson Clark, 1994, p. 410) and Dutton (1994) recommended technician. However, the leading recommendation at this time, according to the survey, is Occupational Therapist Certified (Brown, 1994). Hirama (1994) pointed out that most of these terms were rejected in the 1970s by the Delegate Assembly.

I stand with Hirama (1994) against changing the name to Occupational Therapist Certified or Certified Occupational Therapist. The change would be
confusing because of the Canadian title OT(C) and the title of Occupational Therapist Registered. However, one cannot ignore the hundreds of certified occupational therapy assistants who want a name change as evidenced by 90% of respondents to the ADVANCE survey and those who have written letters to their professional journals and magazines. Apparently there are changes in the practice arena to which certified occupational therapy assistants are sensitive that occupational therapists have neglected to perceive.

Many occupational therapists and other health care providers have no idea of the roles and skills of the certified occupational therapy assistant, which seems to be a major point of contention with certified occupational therapy assistants and those of us who educate them (Baer, 1994; Black, 1994; Clark, 1993b; Demetchick, 1994; Dutton, 1994; Ehlinger, 1993; Janney, 1993). In the Occupational Therapy Assistant Program at Mount Aloysius College, Cresson, Pennsylvania, students are required to carry AOTA's role delineation document (AOTA, 1990) with them to their fieldwork sites. It never ceases to amaze our faculty members how many occupational therapists on those sites will remark to our students, "Oh, I've never seen that before!"

Professional Dialogue

Allen (1993) stated that a "COTA's understanding of activity analysis which allows them to grade activities" (p. 4) distinguishes them from other activities therapists. She further differentiated occupational therapists as having the ability to define functional outcomes. Are other occupational therapists aware that a leading text by Early (1993), which is used to educate certified occupational therapy assistants in mental health, discusses and instructs on using functional goals, establishing functional mobility skills, and writing functional restoration objectives? This type of awareness and understanding is sorely needed to fully understand the capabilities of the certified occupational therapy assistant.

Although Resolution C, which proposed a change in title from Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant to Occupational Therapist Certified, was defeated at the 1994 Representative Assembly meeting, the Assembly was charged to create an ad hoc committee to examine issues raised by Resolution C (see Editor's Note in Hirama, 1994). Such a committee should have been created prior to Resolution C. We need to communicate to members of this committee the many opinions and circumstances that exist in practice and why they occur. We all know of circumstances with which we disagree, such as when certified occupational therapy assistants practice without regard for supervision and when they are strongly encouraged to practice beyond their capabilities or training. To simply pass a resolution saying no to a name change closes a dialogue and our minds to the voice of the certified occupational therapy assistant community.

Changing Times

Even though Congress did not legislate health care reform, health care will continue to be scrutinized by third-party payers. Sunset laws (legislation requiring periodic review of licenses) and licensure laws will continue to be examined for cost-effectiveness. We need to examine the use of certified occupational therapy assistants (practitioners) as a method of providing health care in places where the occupational therapist is not a viable competitor for salary reasons.

A student once asked me, "What if Mary, a certified occupational therapy assistant, finds a job opening, but no occupational therapist is available at that facility. Then Mary encourages the facility to hire a part-time occupational therapist to provide supervision. For cost reasons, the facility hires a consulting occupational therapist and gives Mary the full-time position. Who is assisting whom?" That situation has now occurred more than once in our area in the past year.

Hirama (1994) concluded that the title of Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant is lengthy and awkward. In addition, because occupational therapists are also certified by the American Occupational Therapy Certification Board, she suggested that the name be examined. I agree that we should keep the longer title in the titles to a minimum (i.e., OT for occupational therapist and OTA for occupational therapy associate or OTT for occupational therapy technician). Hirama suggested that states could continue with the L designation for licensure until all states have a license act. This designation is important as a deterrent to other therapies imitating occupational therapy.

The voices of certified occupational therapy assistants and a number of occupational therapists have strongly sounded that the name assistant is not appropriate. It is now up to the occupational therapy profession to openly engage in dialogue and give our treasured colleagues the space and name that more accurately reflects their role.

Editor's Note. Although Resolution C, which mandated a name change now, was defeated, the formation of the ad hoc committee to address all of the complex issues involved in changing the title of the Certified Occupational Therapy Assistant indicates that the Association is aware of the importance of this issue and is serious about resolving it.
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