

Summary of Survey Results

Commonly used Screening and Assessment Tools

<p><u>Language Screening</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BEST-2 • Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (FAST) • Western Aphasia Battery – Bedside 	<p><u>Cognitive Communication</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scales of Cognitive Ability in Traumatic Brain Injury (SCATBI) • Ross Information Processing Assessment – 2 (RIPA-2) • Mini Inventory of Right Brain Injury (MIRBI) • Cognitive Linguistic Quick Test (CLQT) • Functional Assessment of Verbal Reasoning and Executive Functioning Test (FAVRES)
<p><u>Language Assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Western Aphasia Battery (WAB) • Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (BDAE) – full and short forms • Boston Diagnostic Examination of Severe Aphasia (BASA) <p>Additional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Comprehension Battery for Aphasia (RCBA) • Boston Naming Test (BNT) 	<p><u>Functional Communication/Outcome Measures</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functional Independence Measure (FIM) • Communication Activities of Daily Living -2 (CADL-2) • National Outcomes Measurement System (ASHA NOMS) • Functional Assessment of Communication Skills (ASHA FACS) • Australia Therapy Outcome Measures (AusTOMS) • Assessment for Living with Aphasia (ALA) • Assessment of Language Related Functional Activities (ALFA)
<p><u>Motor Speech</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apraxia Battery for Adults (ABA) • Assessment of Intelligibility of Dysarthric Speech (AIDS) • Frenchay Dysarthria Assessment (FDA-2) 	<p><u>Depression Assessment with Aphasia</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aphasic Depression Rating Scale (ADRS) • Stroke Aphasic Depression Questionnaire (SADQ)

Detailed Survey Results: Respondents' Information

Please indicate your position (select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
SLP	100.0%	22
Front-Line Provider	50.0%	11
Manager / Director	0.0%	0
Professional Practice Leader	18.2%	4
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Please indicate the areas of the continuum that you work in (please select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Acute	63.6%	14
In-patient rehab (post-acute)	50.0%	11
Out-patient rehab (ambulatory clinic)	18.2%	4
Complex Continuing Care	31.8%	7
Community (in home)	36.4%	8
Long Term Care	27.3%	6
Other (please specify)	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Indicate which areas of Central East Stroke Network you work in: (select all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Simcoe	27.3%	6
Muskoka	13.6%	3
York	27.3%	6
Durham	22.7%	5
Haliburton, Kawartha, Pine Ridge	27.3%	6
Other (please specify)		0
<i>answered question</i>		22
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Detailed Survey Results: LANGUAGE Tools

Are you familiar with this tool?

Answer Options	Not familiar	Not sure	Somewhat familiar	Familiar	Very familiar	Response Count
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Third Ed.) (BDAE-3) - Full version	0	0	1	7	7	15
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Third Ed.) (BDAE-3) - Short	1	0	2	4	5	12
Western Aphasia Battery - Revised (WAB-R) - Full version	0	0	1	3	10	14
Western Aphasia Battery - Revised (WAB-R) - Bedside version	3	1	2	2	5	13
Boston Assessment of Severe Aphasia (BASA)	3	0	3	6	2	14
Boston Naming Test (BNT)	0	0	0	3	11	14
Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (FAST)	9	0	3	1	1	14
Bedside Evaluation Screening Test (BEST-2)	9	0	3	0	1	13
Psycholinguistic Assessment of Language Processing in Aphasia (PALPA)	7	0	5	1	0	13
Reading Comprehension Battery for Aphasia (RCBA)	1	1	1	4	7	14
Discourse Comprehension Test (DCT)	7	2	0	1	3	13
Porch Index of Communicative Ability (PICA)	4	1	6	3	0	14
Amersterdam-Nijmegen Everyday Language Test (ANELT)	12	1	0	0	0	13
Test of Adolescent/Adult Word Finding (TAWF)	2	1	3	4	4	14
Aphasia Language Performance Scales (ALPS)	11	1	1	0	0	13
Aphasia Screening Test (Whurr, 1974)	13	0	0	0	0	13
Bedside Evaluation and Screening Test (BEST)	11	0	1	0	1	13
Reitan-Indiana Aphasia Screening Test	13	0	0	0	0	13
Sklar Aphasia Scale	13	0	0	0	0	13
Burns Brief Inventory of Communication & Cognition	5	1	3	4	0	13
Aphasia Diagnostic Profiles (ADP)	9	0	2	1	1	13
Comprehensive Aphasia Test (CAT)	12	0	1	0	0	13
Minnesota Test for Differential Diagnosis of Aphasia (MTDDA)	5	0	5	3	1	14
Examining for Aphasia (EFA-4)	11	0	1	0	1	13
Neurosensory Center Comprehensive Examination for Aphasia	13	0	0	0	0	13
Multilingual Aphasia Examination	13	0	0	0	0	13
Bilingual Aphasia Test (BAT)	12	0	2	0	0	14
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)	0	1	6	4	3	14
Token Test	1	1	6	4	2	14
Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices	2	0	7	4	0	13
Aachen Aphasia Battery (AAT)	13	0	0	0	0	13
Action Naming Test (ANT)	10	1	1	0	1	13

Detailed Survey Results: LANGUAGE Tools

Do you use this tool with stroke patients?

Answer Options	Never	Once or twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	Response Count
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Third Ed.) (BDAE-3) - Full version	0	2	8	3	1	14
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Third Ed.) (BDAE-3) - Short	1	1	6	4	0	12
Western Aphasia Battery - Revised (WAB-R) - Full version	1	0	2	8	3	14
Western Aphasia Battery - Revised (WAB-R) - Bedside version	2	2	1	4	2	11
Boston Assessment of Severe Aphasia (BASA)	3	5	3	1	0	12
Boston Naming Test (BNT)	0	0	4	9	1	14
Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (FAST)	9	1	1	0	0	11
Bedside Evaluation Screening Test (BEST-2)	8	1	2	0	0	11
Psycholinguistic Assessment of Language Processing in Aphasia (PALPA)	8	3	1	0	0	12
Reading Comprehension Battery for Aphasia (RCBA)	0	3	4	5	0	12
Discourse Comprehension Test (DCT)	6	2	1	1	0	10
Porch Index of Communicative Ability (PICA)	8	3	0	0	0	11
Amersterdam-Nijmegen Everyday Language Test (ANELT)	10	0	0	0	0	10
Test of Adolescent/Adult Word Finding (TAWF)	3	3	3	4	0	13
Aphasia Language Performance Scales (ALPS)	9	0	0	0	0	9
Aphasia Screening Test (Whurr, 1974)	9	0	0	0	0	9
Bedside Evaluation and Screening Test (BEST)	7	1	1	0	0	9
Reitan-Indiana Aphasia Screening Test	9	0	0	0	0	9
Sklar Aphasia Scale	9	0	0	0	0	9
Burns Brief Inventory of Communication & Cognition	4	2	3	0	0	9
Aphasia Diagnostic Profiles (ADP)	7	2	1	0	0	10
Comprehensive Aphasia Test (CAT)	9	0	0	0	0	9
Minnesota Test for Differential Diagnosis of Aphasia (MTDDA)	6	3	2	0	0	11
Examining for Aphasia (EFA-4)	9	0	1	0	0	10
Neurosensory Center Comprehensive Examination for Aphasia	9	0	0	0	0	9
Multilingual Aphasia Examination	9	0	0	0	0	9
Bilingual Aphasia Test (BAT)	11	0	0	0	0	11
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)	6	8	0	0	0	14
Token Test	6	7	1	0	0	14
Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices	6	5	1	0	0	12
Aachen Aphasia Battery (AAT)	9	0	0	0	0	9
Action Naming Test (ANT)	8	0	0	1	0	9

Detailed Survey Results: LANGUAGE Tools

Do you like this tool for use with stroke patients?

Answer Options	not applicable	Definitely do not like	Somewhat dislike	Neither like nor dislike	Somewhat like	Definitely like	Response Count
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Third Ed.) (BDAE-3) - Full version	0	0	0	3	9	2	14
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Third Ed.) (BDAE-3) - Short	1	0	1	3	5	2	12
Western Aphasia Battery - Revised (WAB-R) - Full version	0	0	0	1	6	6	13
Western Aphasia Battery - Revised (WAB-R) - Bedside version	1	0	0	2	3	5	11
Boston Assessment of Severe Aphasia (BASA)	2	1	1	5	2	1	12
Boston Naming Test (BNT)	0	0	2	4	5	3	14
Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (FAST)	4	1	0	4	1	0	10
Bedside Evaluation Screening Test (BEST-2)	5	0	0	4	1	0	10
Psycholinguistic Assessment of Language Processing in Aphasia (PALPA)	4	0	1	3	1	1	10
Reading Comprehension Battery for Aphasia (RCBA)	0	0	1	3	4	4	12
Discourse Comprehension Test (DCT)	5	0	0	1	2	1	9
Porch Index of Communicative Ability (PICA)	8	0	1	1	0	0	10
Amersterdam-Nijmegen Everyday Language Test (ANELT)	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Test of Adolescent/Adult Word Finding (TAWF)	2	0	0	2	3	5	12
Aphasia Language Performance Scales (ALPS)	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Aphasia Screening Test (Whurr, 1974)	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Bedside Evaluation and Screening Test (BEST)	5	0	0	2	2	0	9
Reitan-Indiana Aphasia Screening Test	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Sklar Aphasia Scale	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Burns Brief Inventory of Communication & Cognition	3	1	1	4	1	0	10
Aphasia Diagnostic Profiles (ADP)	6	0	0	2	2	0	10
Comprehensive Aphasia Test (CAT)	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Minnesota Test for Differential Diagnosis of Aphasia (MTDDA)	3	1	2	2	2	0	10
Examining for Aphasia (EFA-4)	6	0	0	2	1	0	9
Neurosensory Center Comprehensive Examination for Aphasia	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Multilingual Aphasia Examination	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Bilingual Aphasia Test (BAT)	8	0	0	2	0	0	10
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)	3	0	2	5	2	0	12
Token Test	4	0	2	4	1	1	12
Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices	4	0	1	6	0	0	11
Aachen Aphasia Battery (AAT)	7	0	0	2	0	0	9
Action Naming Test (ANT)	7	0	0	1	0	1	9

Detailed Survey Results: LANGUAGE Tools

In which parts of the continuum do you use this tool (with stroke patients)?

Answer Options	N/A	Acute	In-patient rehab (post-acute)	Out-patient rehab (ambulatory)	Complex Continuing Care	Community (in home)	Long Term Care	other	Response Count
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Third Ed.)	0	4	10	4	4	2	2	0	13
Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination (Third Ed.)	1	5	9	3	2	1	1	0	14
Western Aphasia Battery - Revised (WAB-R) - Full	0	5	10	4	5	4	4	0	13
Western Aphasia Battery - Revised (WAB-R) -	3	6	3	2	1	1	1	0	12
Boston Assessment of Severe Aphasia (BASA)	5	2	6	0	2	1	0	0	13
Boston Naming Test (BNT)	0	5	10	2	3	2	2	0	13
Frenchay Aphasia Screening Test (FAST)	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Bedside Evaluation Screening Test (BEST-2)	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Psycholinguistic Assessment of Language	8	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	10
Reading Comprehension Battery for Aphasia (RCBA)	0	5	9	4	4	3	3	0	13
Discourse Comprehension Test (DCT)	7	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	10
Porch Index of Communicative Ability (PICA)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Amersterdam-Nijmegen Everyday Language Test	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Test of Adolescent/Adult Word Finding (TAWF)	4	2	6	0	2	1	1	0	11
Aphasia Language Performance Scales (ALPS)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Aphasia Screening Test (Whurr, 1974)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Bedside Evaluation and Screening Test (BEST)	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Reitan-Indiana Aphasia Screening Test	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Sklar Aphasia Scale	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Burns Brief Inventory of Communication & Cognition	6	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	10
Aphasia Diagnostic Profiles (ADP)	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
Comprehensive Aphasia Test (CAT)	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Minnesota Test for Differential Diagnosis of Aphasia	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	10
Examining for Aphasia (EFA-4)	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Neurosensory Center Comprehensive Examination for	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Multilingual Aphasia Examination	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Bilingual Aphasia Test (BAT)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)	6	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	10
Token Test	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	11
Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
Aachen Aphasia Battery (AAT)	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Action Naming Test (ANT)	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10

Detailed Survey Results: SPEECH Tools

Are you familiar with this tool?

Answer Options	Not familiar	Not sure	Somewhat familiar	Familiar	Very familiar	Response Count
Frenchay Dysarthria Assessment–2nd Edition (FDA- Apraxia Battery for Adults (ABA-2)	3	0	5	2	4	14
Assessment of Intelligibility of Dysarthric Speech	0	0	2	5	7	14
Dysarthria Profile (Robertson, S.J., 1982)	2	0	2	4	6	14
Test of Oral and Limb Apraxia	7	0	3	1	2	13
	7	1	3	1	2	14

Do you use this tool with stroke patients?

Answer Options	Never	Once or twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	Response Count
Frenchay Dysarthria Assessment–2nd Edition (FDA- Apraxia Battery for Adults (ABA-2)	6	1	2	3	0	12
Assessment of Intelligibility of Dysarthric Speech	3	1	4	4	2	14
Dysarthria Profile (Robertson, S.J., 1982)	3	0	4	4	1	12
Test of Oral and Limb Apraxia	7	2	1	1	1	12
	6	3	1	0	0	10

Do you use this tool with stroke patients?

Answer Options	not applicable	Definitely do not like	Somewhat dislike	Neither like nor dislike	Somewhat like	Definitely like	Response Count
Frenchay Dysarthria Assessment–2nd Edition (FDA- Apraxia Battery for Adults (ABA-2)	2	1	1	1	4	1	10
Assessment of Intelligibility of Dysarthric Speech	0	1	1	3	4	3	12
Dysarthria Profile (Robertson, S.J., 1982)	0	1	3	2	2	3	11
Test of Oral and Limb Apraxia	4	1	0	2	4	0	11
	4	1	0	3	1	0	9

Detailed Survey Results: SPEECH Tools

In which parts of the continuum do you use this tool (with stroke patients)?

Answer Options	N/A	Acute	In-patient rehab (post-acute)	Out-patient rehab (ambulatory)	Complex Continuing Care	Community (in home)	Long Term Care	other	Response Count
Frenchay Dysarthria Assessment–2nd Edition (FDA-2)	5	2	3	2	1	1	1	0	10
Apraxia Battery for Adults (ABA-2)	2	5	8	2	2	1	1	0	12
Assessment of Intelligibility of Dysarthric Speech (AIDS)	3	3	6	2	2	1	1	0	11
Dysarthria Profile (Robertson, S.J., 1982)	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
Test of Oral and Limb Apraxia	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	11

Detailed Survey Results: COGNITIVE COMMUNICATION / RIGHT HEMISPHERE DYSFUNCTION Tools

Are you familiar with this tool?

Answer Options	Not familiar	Not sure	Somewhat familiar	Familiar	Very familiar	Response Count
Scales of Cognitive Ability following Traumatic Brain	0	0	2	4	7	13
Ross Information Processing Assessment (RIPA)	1	0	3	5	3	12
Functional Assessment of Verbal Reasoning and	6	0	3	2	1	12
Cognitive Linguistic Quick Test	7	0	2	0	3	12
Test of Everyday Attention (TEA)	11	0	0	1	0	12
Behavioural Assessment of Dysexecutive Syndrome	11	0	1	0	0	12
Burns Brief Inventory of Communication & Cognition	6	0	3	2	1	12
Mini-Inventory of Right Brain Injury (MIRBI-2)	3	0	4	2	3	12

Do you use this tool with stroke patients?

Answer Options	Never	Once or twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	Response Count
Scales of Cognitive Ability following Traumatic Brain	1	2	7	3	0	13
Ross Information Processing Assessment (RIPA)	0	2	5	4	0	11
Functional Assessment of Verbal Reasoning and	6	0	3	0	0	9
Cognitive Linguistic Quick Test	5	0	1	2	0	8
Test of Everyday Attention (TEA)	8	0	0	0	0	8
Behavioural Assessment of Dysexecutive Syndrome	8	0	0	0	0	8
Burns Brief Inventory of Communication & Cognition	6	0	3	0	0	9
Mini-Inventory of Right Brain Injury (MIRBI-2)	3	2	3	0	1	9

Detailed Survey Results: COGNITIVE COMMUNICATION / RIGHT HEMISPHERE DYSFUNCTION Tools

Do you like this tool for use with stroke patients?

Answer Options	not applicable	Definitely do not like	Somewhat dislike	Neither like nor dislike	Somewhat like	Definitely like	Response Count
Scales of Cognitive Ability following Traumatic Brain	1	0	1	0	8	3	13
Ross Information Processing Assessment (RIPA)	0	0	1	3	4	2	10
Functional Assessment of Verbal Reasoning and	4	0	0	1	3	1	9
Cognitive Linguistic Quick Test	3	0	0	2	2	1	8
Test of Everyday Attention (TEA)	5	0	0	2	1	0	8
Behavioural Assessment of Dysexecutive Syndrome	6	0	0	2	0	0	8
Burns Brief Inventory of Communication & Cognition	2	1	0	5	1	0	9
Mini-Inventory of Right Brain Injury (MIRBI-2)	0	1	0	6	1	1	9

In which parts of the continuum do you use this tool (with stroke patients)?

Answer Options	N/A	Acute	In-patient rehab (post-acute)	Out-patient rehab (ambulatory clinic)	Complex Continuing Care	Community (in home)	Long Term Care	other	Response Count
Scales of Cognitive Ability following Traumatic Brain	1	2	7	3	1	3	1	0	12
Ross Information Processing Assessment (RIPA)	1	4	8	2	1	1	0	0	12
Functional Assessment of Verbal Reasoning and	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	11
Cognitive Linguistic Quick Test	7	2	1	2	1	1	1	0	10
Test of Everyday Attention (TEA)	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Behavioural Assessment of Dysexecutive Syndrome	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Burns Brief Inventory of Communication & Cognition	5	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	10
Mini-Inventory of Right Brain Injury (MIRBI-2)	3	3	5	3	3	2	2	0	10

Detailed Survey Results: FUNCTIONAL COMMUNICATION Tools

Are you familiar with this tool?

Answer Options	Not familiar	Not sure	Somewhat familiar	Familiar	Very familiar	Response Count
Functional Assessment of Communication Skills for Adults	3	0	5	3	2	13
National Outcomes Measurement System Functional	5	0	4	2	2	13
Communication Activities of Daily Living (CADL-2)	2	2	4	3	1	12
Assessment of Language-Related Functional Abilities	8	1	1	2	0	12
Communicative Effectiveness Index (CETI)	6	1	3	1	1	12
Functional Communication Profile (FCP)	7	1	4	0	0	12
Amsterdam Nijmegen Everyday Language Test (ANELT)	11	1	0	0	0	12
Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile	9	2	1	0	0	12
Functional Independence Measures (FIM)	0	0	2	3	7	12
Quality of Communication Life Scale (QCL) (ASHA, 2004)	9	1	1	1	0	12
Communication Effectiveness Index (CETI)	6	1	2	2	1	12
Community Activity Log (CAL)	10	1	1	0	0	12

Do you use this tool with stroke patients?

Answer Options	Never	Once or twice	Occasionally	Frequently	Always	Response Count
Functional Assessment of Communication Skills for Adults	6	3	2	1	0	12
National Outcomes Measurement System Functional	8	0	0	1	2	11
Communication Activities of Daily Living (CADL-2)	6	1	3	0	0	10
Assessment of Language-Related Functional Abilities	7	0	1	0	0	8
Communicative Effectiveness Index (CETI)	5	3	0	1	0	9
Functional Communication Profile (FCP)	6	3	0	0	0	9
Amsterdam Nijmegen Everyday Language Test (ANELT)	8	0	0	0	0	8
Revised Edinburgh Functional Communication Profile	7	1	0	0	0	8
Functional Independence Measures (FIM)	2	0	0	3	7	12
Quality of Communication Life Scale (QCL) (ASHA, 2004)	6	1	1	0	0	8
Communication Effectiveness Index (CETI)	5	2	1	1	0	9
Community Activity Log (CAL)	8	0	0	0	0	8

