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This report outlines the rationale, procedures and findings of the 2014 NCTRC Job Analysis Study. The job analysis study was conducted by NCTRC with technical assistance from Prometric testing service. Prometric is recognized as a global leader in occupational testing and exam development and currently serves as the test contractor for the NCTRC exam program.

The purpose of the job analysis study was to identify the tasks and knowledge that are important for competent performance by entry-level certificants. The study was conducted to answer the essential question: what are the important job tasks related to competent practice and what knowledge and skills are essential for competent performance? The findings of the job analysis study serve as the basis of the NCTRC Certification Exam and inform the CTRS® about content areas for continuing education.

RATIONALE

A benchmark for any profession is its ability to routinely monitor its own practice through an ongoing process of self-regulation. Paramount to this process is the creation of a credentialing program that enables the profession to safeguard consumers by stating who is competent to practice. The establishment of a valid job analysis is essential to the integrity of a credentialing program and its associated exam program. The job analysis translates practice into a usable format for test development. It delineates the important tasks and knowledge deemed necessary for competent practice.

A well-conducted job analysis helps insure that a certification exam is job related and thus has content validity. The process directly links the content of the certification exam to field-identified important job tasks (Oltman & Rosenfield, 1997). Therefore, the job analysis process is an essential component in establishing the content validity of a credentialing exam (Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, 2014).

METHODS

A variety of methods exist for the completion of a job analysis. The most accepted practice is to use multiple sources of job information and then check for agreement among subject matter experts (certificants). The process is enhanced by the inclusion of large numbers of subject matter experts who represent the diversity of relevant areas of expertise and practice. Within the current study, several different sources of information about entry-level practice were considered with the most significant being the 2007 NCTRC Job Analysis Inventory (NCTRC, 2007). This comprehensive inventory of 131 job related tasks and knowledge areas was reviewed by the Task Force Committee composed of nine (9) subject matter experts who were Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialists. Members of the Task Force Committee represented the diversity of settings, populations, and levels of service found in therapeutic recreation practice across the United States and Canada. The Task Force Committee, after careful analysis, modified the original job analysis inventory to reflect current practice, keeping in mind the skills necessary for competent performance and protection of the consumer.

Based upon the work of the Task Force Committee, Prometric developed a draft inventory survey, complete with rating scales and demographic questions. More specifically, the survey consisted of five (5) sections:

1. Background and General Information
2. Tasks
3. Knowledge
4. Test Content Recommendations
5. Comments

The survey was pilot tested using a sample of nine CTRS® subject matter experts. After slight modification, the survey was then sent to the entire population of active certificants (N=11,554) via email or postal mail. The survey results were used to guide the development of test specifications and content-valid examinations.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: DEMOGRAPHICS

Of the 11,554 Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialists invited to participate in the survey, a total of 3,029 (26%) individuals submitted completed surveys. The largest reported job profile was that of Recreation Therapist (44.5%) in a hospital work setting (32%) and certified for 10 or more years (54%). Results by self-description indicated that respondents varied with respect to gender (female, 88.6%; and male, 11.4%), and racial/ethnic background (White, 86.8%; and Non-white, 13.2%). All U.S. states and most Canadian provinces were represented within the study. A more complete summary of demographic results is presented in Table 1.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: TASK DOMAINS

With regard to the 10 task domains, respondents were asked to rate each of 69 job responsibility statements using a five-point scale (“0”=of no importance to “4”=very important). Within the final analysis, a mean importance rating of 2.5 and higher (moderate to very important) was established to identify those tasks or professional responsibilities that were to be included in the test development process.* The 69 task statements with corresponding means and standard deviation values appear in Table 2. Some of the statements have been abbreviated to accommodate the display of data. In addition to the statements, mean scores (higher scores = more important) and standard deviations (small scores = more agreement) are provided. The top rated job tasks according to corresponding means and standard deviations are presented in Table 4. Clearly noted within the top rated job tasks are individual tasks from the designated domain areas of Professional Relationships and Responsibilities, Document Intervention Services, and Implement Interventions and/or Programs. Significant representation from these domain areas along with job tasks from the domain area of Assessment clearly underscores the importance of the therapeutic recreation process within TR/RT practice.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: KNOWLEDGE AREAS

With regard to the six (6) established knowledge domains, respondents were asked to rate each of the 57 knowledge areas using a five point scale (“0” = of no importance to “4” = very important). As with the job tasks, a 2.5 importance rating criterion was established for consideration of acceptance*. The knowledge areas are presented in Table 3.

The knowledge areas with the highest importance ratings according to corresponding means and standard deviations are listed in Table 5. The majority of the top listed knowledge areas were from the defined domain areas of Foundational Knowledge and Assessment Process. This finding, once again, highlights the overall importance of the therapeutic recreation APIED process within TR/RT practice. The knowledge areas that were rated lower in importance (but still at the 2.5 level or above) tended to be in the areas of Administration of Therapeutic Recreation/Recreation Therapy Service and Advancement of the Profession.

**Table 1: Summary of Demographic Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2669</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Background</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>2608</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial/Multi-ethnic</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Representation</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Practice</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more years</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Test Specification Committee retained certain tasks and knowledge areas below the 2.5 rating threshold due to the importance of these areas to TR services.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: CONTENT COVERAGE RATINGS
The survey participants were asked to indicate how well the statements within each of the task and knowledge domains covered important aspects of that area. These responses provide an indication of the adequacy (comprehensiveness) of the survey content. The five-point rating scale included 1=Very Poorly, 2=Poorly, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, and 5=Very Well. The means and standard deviations for the task and knowledge ratings are provided in Tables 6 and 7. For the task domains, the means ranged from 3.1 to 3.3. The means across the knowledge domains ranged from 3.1 to 3.3. These findings provide supportive evidence that the tasks and knowledge were comprehensive and well-covered on the survey.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: TEST CONTENT RECOMMENDATIONS
The final section of the survey asked respondents to suggest the percentage of examination coverage to be allotted to each of the overall six established knowledge domains. The Test Specification Committee then reviewed this information as a factor in making the decision about how much emphasis (percent) each knowledge domain should receive within the test content outline.

TABLE 2: JOB TASK DOMAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Job Task Domains</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Establish/maintain effective working relationships</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Create/maintain a safe/therapeutic environment</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Maintain CTRS/required state credentials(s)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Participate in in-service training/staff development</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Maintain knowledge of current TR/RT trends</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Enhance professional competence/additional credentials</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Enhance professional competence</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Support the development of evidence-based practices</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Adhere to professional SOP and code of ethics</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Participate in quality improvement process</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Participate in agency/professional committees</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Request/secure referrals/orders</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Obtain/review pertinent information</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Select/develop assessment methods/setting</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Establish therapeutic relationship</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Conduct assessments</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Analyze/interpret results</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Integrate/record/disseminate results</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Discuss results of assessment</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Develop/document intervention plan</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Develop/select interventions/approaches</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Develop/select protocols</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Utilize activity/task analysis</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Select adaptations/modifications/assistive technology</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Explain purpose/outcomes of the intervention/program</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Implement individual/group session(s)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Use leadership/facilitation/adaptation techniques</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Monitor/address safety</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Observe for response to intervention/program</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Monitor effectiveness of intervention/program</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Evaluate changes in functioning</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Determine effectiveness of individual intervention plan</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Revise individualized intervention plan</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Evaluate for additional/alternative/discharge of services</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Determine effectiveness of protocols/programs</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Complete version of the NCTRC Job Task Domains is available online at nctrc.org.*
### TABLE 3: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE DOMAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Professional Knowledge Domains</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human developmental stages</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Human behavior/principles of behavioral change</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concepts/models of health/human services</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Principles of group dynamics/leadership</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislative/regulatory guidelines/standards</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Contributions of play/recreation/leisure</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Models of TR/RT service delivery</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Practice settings</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Standards of practice</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Code of ethics</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Professional qualifications</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cultural competency</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cognitive/developmental disorders, related impairments</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Physical/medical disorders, related impairments</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Psychiatric disorders, related impairments</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ASSESSMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Professional Knowledge Domains</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Current TR/RT assessment instruments</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Interprofessional inventories/questionnaire</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Secondary sources of assessment data</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Criteria for selection and/or development of assessment</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Implementation of assessment</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sensory assessment</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Social assessment</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Physical assessment</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Affective assessment</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Leisure assessment</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Functional skills assessment</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4: TOP JOB TASKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish/maintain effective working relationships</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Create/maintain a safe/therapeutic environment</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Establish therapeutic relationship with person(s) served</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Monitor/address safety concerns</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Comply with standards/regulations</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Adhere to professional SOP/code of ethics</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Document occurrences relating to risk management</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Use leadership/facilitation/adaptation techniques</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Follow risk management practices</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Document behavioral observations</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Obtain/review pertinent information</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Observe for response to intervention/program</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Monitor effectiveness of intervention/program</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Evaluate changes in functioning</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5: TOP KNOWLEDGE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Knowledge Areas</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cognitive/developmental disorders, related impairments</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Social assessment</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Selection of programs</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Advocacy for person(s) served</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Public relations/promotion/marketing</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Professional associations/organizations</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Research activities</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Higher education/service provider collaboration</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Complete version of the NCTRC Professional Knowledge Domains is available online at nctrc.org.*

*Complete version of the NCTRC Job Tasks is available online at nctrc.org.*

*Complete version of the NCTRC Knowledge Areas is available online at nctrc.org.*
The NCTRC Certification Exam is a computer based test consisting of 150 multiple choice questions. The final recommendations of the Test Specification Committee regarding the test content percentages from each knowledge domain are presented in Table 8.

**JOB ANALYSIS DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY**

The purpose of the 2014 NCTRC Job Analysis Study was to identify and validate tasks and knowledge important in the work performed by certificants. The results of the study were utilized to create test specifications that will guide the development of new versions of the NCTRC Certification Exam. The study results will also serve as a framework for the CTRS regarding content selection of continuing education for re-certification.

The 2014 Job Analysis results reflect an overall pattern consistent with the 2007 Job Analysis Study and other previously conducted studies regarding important aspects of therapeutic recreation practice. Although no widespread or substantial changes were observed within the 2014 study results, several subtle changes were noted.

In reviewing the demographic profile of the respondents, consistency of findings were noted between the 2014 study and previous studies with respect to gender, ethnicity, and geographic location. In the current study, respondents had a longer tenure within therapeutic recreation and were certified for a longer period of time than their counterparts in the 2007 study. Shifts in the nature of service settings were also observed during the seven year time period between studies, with an increase observed in the geriatric and developmental disability care settings. Respondents within the current study reported that they work more with adults and older adults than with other age groups. A shift toward more direct care on the part of respondents was observed, suggesting a possible decrease in administrative and managerial positions.

A review of the job tasks data reveals that the number of specific tasks increased from 58 to 69. This increase in the number of tasks may be a result of the re-alignment of the general task domains (N=10) from 2007 to 2014. However, upon review of the highest rated job tasks (Table 4) it is evident that those job activities directly related to direct client care (including assessment, planning, implementation, evaluation, and documentation) are still viewed by respondents as the most important tasks in TR/RT service delivery. The observed drop in the reported importance of organization and management tasks may be indicative of certificants working in more client-centered practice settings, and perhaps less responsible for managerial job assignments.

Similar findings within the knowledge domains for professional competency (Table 5) underscore the importance of the core therapeutic recreation process (i.e., assessment, planning, implementation, and documentation). This finding is most evident by the fact that many of the top rated knowledge areas are contained within the knowledge domains of Assessment, Documentation, and Implementation. Interesting to note is the observation that several of the top rated knowledge areas are specific to the area of assessment, reinforcing the importance of this process to the practice of TR/RT. The knowledge domains of Administration of Therapeutic Recreation/Recreation Therapy Services and Advancement of the Profession while found to be important, were not deemed to be as critical to competent practice as the knowledge domain of the Assessment, Documentation, and Implementation. The results of the 2014 NCTRC Job Analysis Study point to a well defined and consistently applied profession. The study findings suggest that although several areas of change have occurred, the core foundation of the profession has remained intact. As a result, the findings contained within this report provide a valid foundation for the NCTRC exam development process. The certification examination reflects this emphasis, and rests on a sound body of evidence to support its relevance to professional practice.
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TABLE 6: CONTENT COVERAGE RATING: TASK DOMAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Task Domains</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Professional Relationships and Responsibilities</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Plan Interventions and/or Programs</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Implement Interventions and/or Programs</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Evaluate Outcomes of the Interventions/Programs</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Document Intervention Services</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Treatment Teams and/or Service Providers</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Develop and Maintain Programs</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Manage TR/RT Services</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Awareness and Advocacy</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7: CONTENT COVERAGE RATING: KNOWLEDGE DOMAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Knowledge Domains</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Theories and Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Practice Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Diagnostic Groupings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Selection and Implementation of Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Assessment Domains</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Administration of TR/RT Service</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Advancement of the Profession</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8: TEST CONTENT WEIGHTS RECOMMENDED BY TEST SPECIFICATIONS COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Areas</th>
<th>Percentage of Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Knowledge</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Process</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of TR/RT Service</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement of the Profession</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Given the diversity and varied settings in which TR/RT services are practiced, it becomes a challenge to select terminology that is inclusive of the entire profession. The list provided represents terms chosen to describe aspects of practice and the persons served. These terms are broad-based and can be applied to all settings and populations served. The intent here is to “include” rather than “exclude” any aspect of the profession.

Therapeutic Recreation/Recreation Therapy: all references to TR/RT in this document are intended to be used interchangeably.

Persons Served: a patient, client, consumer, participant or resident.

Individualized Intervention Plan: an individualized plan of care or intervention for a person served by a qualified TR/RT professional (CTRS) based on assessed strengths and needs, and includes goals, objectives and intervention strategies aimed at fostering desirable and necessary outcomes.

Treatment/Service Teams: also referred to as “intervention team”, and “multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary team”. A treatment team is a group of qualified professionals who provide individual and collective treatment to address the needs of a specific individual receiving service.

Standards of Practice: statements of professional expectations for service delivery in order to assure systematic provision of recreation therapy services. Such statements are set by the organizations representing the specific profession.

Inclusion: a planning process in which individuals with disabilities have the opportunity to participate fully in all community activities offered to people without disabilities. Inclusion requires providing the necessary framework for adaptations, accommodations and supports so that the individual can benefit equally from an experience.

Outcomes: observed changes in an individual’s health status and functional abilities as a result of services. Outcomes must be measurable, achievable, documented, meaningful, and linked to professional intervention.
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