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Title: A behaviour change program to increase outings delivered during therapy to stroke survivors by community rehabilitation teams: the Out-and-About trial

ABSTRACT

Background: Australian guidelines recommend that outdoor mobility be addressed to increase participation after stroke.

Aim: To investigate the efficacy of the Out-and-About program at increasing outings delivered during therapy by community teams, and outings taken by stroke survivors in real life.

Method: Cluster-randomised trial involving 22 community teams providing stroke rehabilitation. Experimental teams received the Out-and-About program (a behaviour change program comprising a training workshop with barrier identification and booster session, printed educational materials, audit and feedback). Control teams received printed clinical guidelines only. The primary outcome was the percentage of stroke survivors receiving four or more outings during therapy. Secondary outcomes included the number of outings received by stroke survivors during therapy and undertaken in real life.

Results: At 12 months after implementation of the behaviour change program, 9% audited experimental group stroke survivors received four or more outings during therapy compared with 5% in the control group (adjusted risk difference 4%, 95% CI -9 to 17, p=0.54). They received 1.1 (SD 0.9) outings during therapy compared with 0.6 (SD 1.0) in the control group (adjusted mean difference 0.5, 95% CI -0.4 to 1.4; p=0.26). After 6 months of rehabilitation, observed experimental group stroke survivors took 9.0 (SD 3.0) outings per week in real life compared with 7.4 (SD 4.0) in the control group (adjusted mean difference 0.5, 95% CI -1.8 to 2.8; p = 0.63).

Conclusion: The Out-and-About program did not change team or stroke survivor behaviour.

Trial registration: Australia and New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ACTRN12611000554965).

Word count including abstract: 3358
INTRODUCTION
Approximately one third of Australian stroke survivors need help to walk or travel outdoors (1). After hospital discharge, mobility training can increase walking performance (2), but improved walking indoors does not automatically translate into improved walking outdoors. For example, crowded environments such as shopping malls are challenging for people with reduced mobility. Stroke survivors often do not venture out alone because they lack confidence and fear falling (3), thereby decreasing their quality of life.

Delivering outdoor-related sessions during therapy (including outings involving overground walking or bus travel and provision of transport information) can help stroke survivors to get out more often and improve quality of life (4). In 2004, Logan and colleagues reported that 4.7 outdoor-related sessions delivered over three months to community-dwelling stroke survivors resulted in 8.5 outdoor ‘journeys’/wk in real life compared to 3.2 outdoor ‘journeys’/wk in a control group that received transport information only (4). Importantly, the intervention was only provided to stroke survivors who reported wanting to get out more often. Based on these findings, the intervention was recommended as best practice in the 2010 Australian national stroke guidelines (5):

People faced with difficulties in community transport and mobility should...undertake tailored strategies such as multiple....escorted outdoor journeys (which may include practice crossing roads, visits to local shops, bus or train travel), help to resume driving, aids and equipment, and written information about local transport options/alternatives, p 88' (5)

We therefore developed a behaviour change program targeting community rehabilitation teams – the Out-and-About program – to implement this intervention. The program includes strategies known to be effective for changing practice (6): educational meetings (7), printed educational materials including clinical guidelines (8), and file audit followed by feedback (9). The behaviour change program was piloted with five community rehabilitation teams (10) and found to be feasible to deliver. Furthermore, after 12 months, 39% of their stroke survivor caseload received four or more outdoor-related sessions during therapy compared with 21% pre-intervention.

The aim of this randomised trial was to investigate the efficacy of the Out-and-About program on both team and stroke survivor behaviour. The research questions were:
1. Do community teams that receive the Out-and-About program deliver more outings during therapy to stroke survivors than control teams that receive written clinical guidelines only?

2. Do stroke survivors that are seen by these community teams undertake more outings in real life, and travel further, than those seen by control teams?

Outings during therapy (ie, beyond the perimeter of the hospital/property into public streets) were the focus of intervention in order to increase the likelihood of transfer into real life.

**METHOD**

**Design**

A two-group, cluster-randomised trial was conducted with concealed allocation, blinded assessment and intention-to-treat analysis (11) (Figure 1). Because therapists were the target of intervention, teams were randomised to experimental or control intervention by an independent randomisation service. Minimisation was used (12) to ensure balance of four variables across teams: location of team (centre- or home-based), funding of team (public or private), volume of caseload (high ≥ 50 or low < 50 stroke referrals per year), and level of outings (high ≥ 2; low < 2 outings during therapy per stroke survivor). To optimise blinding of therapists, only team leaders were privy to study aims. Measurers (of audited or observed stroke survivors) were blinded to team allocation. Approval to audit medical records was obtained from university and local ethics committees.

**Inclusion criteria for teams**

All teams that delivered post-hospital rehabilitation in Sydney, Newcastle and two regional areas of NSW (Illawarra and Central Coast) were approached (n=79). Teams were eligible to participate if they (i) employed at least one occupational therapist and one physiotherapist, (ii) received ≥10 stroke referrals annually, and (iii) delivered < 4 outings during therapy to individual stroke survivors who wanted to get out more often. Teams were categorised by type of service (outpatient, day therapy or home-based rehabilitation) location, funding, caseload volume, and level of outings.

**Intervention**

The experimental teams received a behaviour change program (11) including a training workshop with barrier identification and booster session, printed educational materials, audit
and feedback (see Supplementary File).

Training workshop: A 2-hour workshop was conducted at each site by AM and attended by team physiotherapists, occupational therapists and therapy assistants. A target of six or more outings during therapy was set. Outings were to be conducted in local streets and could include public transport training, overground walking, help with return to driving, and/or supervised practice using a motorised scooter. The configuration of outings and content were to be individually tailored by treating therapists. Two case studies, demonstrating how up to six outings might be provided during therapy, were presented.

Barrier identification: 20 minutes was allocated for discussion of audit results, and identification of barriers and enablers to implementing the intervention. Key barriers were similar to those identified in the pilot study (13), but also included limited skills and knowledge about risk management and safety, vehicle access and health fund regulations. Strategies for overcoming barriers (such as reminders at weekly team meetings and use of therapy assistants) were discussed.

Printed educational materials: These included (a) screening questions to ask stroke survivors about weekly outings, usual modes of travel, and driving status; (b) evidence-informed protocols developed by the investigators for progressing walking distance and difficulty, bus, train and scooter travel, and road safety; (c) driving and transport information; (d) a form for recording outings during therapy; and (e) the 2010 stroke guidelines (5).

Audit and feedback: Consecutive medical records of the most recently discharged stroke survivors were audited for each team. Twenty consecutive medical records were requested so that at least 15 records could be audited. Data were graphed, presented verbally and in writing to experimental teams by AM. De-identified data were compared across teams (ie, benchmarking). The data included number of outings and outdoor-related sessions per stroke survivor, total number of therapy sessions provided, duration of therapy, time to first therapy session and stroke severity.

Booster session: At nine of the 11 experimental sites, a 1-hour ‘booster’ session was conducted 12 months post-workshop by AM. Two experimental teams did not receive booster sessions (one team had disbanded, another had finished recruitment). Audit feedback
was re-presented to staff, followed by discussion about how/if teams were overcoming barriers to implementation.

Control teams received a copy of the 2010 stroke guidelines (5) by mail.

**Outcome measures**

*Outings delivered during therapy:* The primary outcome was team behaviour defined as the percentage of *audited* stroke survivors receiving four or more outings during therapy, measured by auditing medical records at 12 months.

Twenty consecutive medical records were requested so that at least 15 records could be audited. Stroke survivors had to have sustained their stroke within the previous 12 months. Two trained researchers audited the medical records. Initially, data were extracted independently from 10 files by these two researchers and their data compared until consistency was achieved.

Secondary outcomes included the number of outdoor-related sessions delivered during therapy. Outdoor-related sessions were categorised as an *outing* (a therapist-escorted outing beyond the perimeter of the hospital/property into a public street), *outdoor practice* (practice on steps or uneven ground within the hospital/property), or *outdoor information* (provision of information about outings, preparation for outings or advice about return to driving).

Descriptive information was collected about the *audited* stroke survivors at the commencement of therapy, including demographics (age, sex, marital status, living situation), stroke type, stroke severity (Scandinavian Stroke Scale retrospectively) (SSS; 14) and dependency (Modified Rankin Scale retrospectively) (15). Post-inpatient therapy received by the audited stroke survivors was also recorded, including wait time (days from inpatient discharge to therapy commencement), duration of therapy, and number of sessions delivered.

*Outings undertaken in real life:* Secondary outcome data collected directly from stroke survivors (the *observed* sample) included the number and purpose of outings per week, mode of travel used, and distance travelled per week, measured at baseline and six months later. Stroke survivors referred to teams for post-inpatient therapy were sequentially included if
they were ≥18 years; had sustained a stroke in the previous 12 months; could provide informed consent and complete self-report outcome measures with/without an interpreter or next of kin; lived at home, in a hostel or nursing home; could walk 10-m outdoors with/without a walking aid or supervision, and were not getting out of the house as often or as far as desired.

The number, purpose and mode of travel of weekly outings were measured using a self-report diary, at baseline and six months later. At six months, distance travelled per week was measured using a global positioning system (11), and the extent of travel was measured using the Life-Space Assessment (16).

Descriptive information was collected about the observed stroke survivors at commencement of therapy, including demographics (age, sex, marital status, living situation), stroke type and dependency (Modified Rankin Scale) (15), type of dwelling and walking capacity.

**Sample size**
The study was powered with respect to the primary outcome. In our pilot study (10), 25% of stroke survivors received four or more outings during therapy before the Out-and-About program. Assuming that guideline dissemination would increase this rate to 30%, the Out-and-About program would be considered effective if 50% received four or more outings, that is, a difference of 20%. With an intra-cluster correlation coefficient of zero (10), 186 medical records would be needed to detect a 20% difference, with 80% power, (two-sided). A target of 300 medical records was set in order to detect a 20% difference with 80% power at a 5% significance level, if the intra-cluster correlation coefficient was 0·04, and 90% power if it was 0·01. We planned to recruit at least 20 teams (or clusters), and audit an average of 15 stroke survivor records per team.

**Data analysis**
Outcomes were analysed using intention-to-treat analyses. Due to the small number of clusters, cluster level t-tests were used (17). For the observed stroke survivors’ outcomes measured after six months, the cluster level t-tests were also adjusted for their baseline value. Cluster level t-tests were repeated for all outcomes which further adjusted for age, sex, living status, team location and funding. A sensitivity analysis was also conducted at the individual
stroke survivor level using mixed effects models, with binary (proportions) and count outcomes analysed using logistic and negative binomial regression models respectively. The negative binomial model was used instead of a Poisson model due to data being overdispersed (18). All models included the experimental group as a covariate in the model, with clustering adjusted for using mixed models, with a random effect for cluster. Models were fitted with and without other covariates – the covariates the same as listed above for the cluster level analysis. These analyses gave results which were not qualitatively different (therefore results not presented).

RESULTS

Characteristics of teams
Of 79 healthcare teams contacted, 32 met the eligibility criteria; 24 were recruited and eight declined or were non-responsive (three public outpatient services, three private day program services, one public day program service, one private outpatient service). Two of the teams were excluded after auditing but prior to randomisation, because they were already providing four or more outings per stroke survivor (Figure 1). Between July 2011 and November 2012, 11 experimental teams received the Out-and-About program and written guidelines, and 11 teams received the guidelines only. Most of the 22 teams were centre-based and publicly-funded. A median of three therapists was employed per team (range 2 to 13). Between July 2010 and November 2012, baseline audits were completed of 263 medical records across the 22 teams (median 13 records/team, range 5 to 20), capturing therapy between July 2009 and November 2012. Cluster randomisation achieved a balance between experimental and control teams in terms of location, funding, therapists employed, and level of outings during therapy (Table 1).

Characteristics of stroke survivors audited at 12 months
Between July 2012 and December 2013, 279 medical records were audited at 12 months (median of 12 per team, range 0 to 23), capturing therapy between July 2011 and December 2013. Cluster randomisation (of teams) achieved balance between experimental and control stroke survivors audited at 12 months for characteristics and post-inpatient therapy received (Table 2).
Effect of intervention on team behaviour: outings delivered during therapy

Only 9% of experimental stroke survivors audited at 12 months received four or more outings during therapy compared with 5% of control stroke survivors (adjusted risk difference 4%, 95% CI -9 to 17, p=0.54) (Table 3). 60% of experimental stroke survivors audited at 12 months did not receive any outings compared with 73% of control stroke survivors (adjusted risk difference 12%, 95% CI -9 to 34; p=0.25). 1.1 (SD 0.9) outings during therapy were delivered to experimental stroke survivors, audited at 12 months compared with 0.6 (SD 1.0) delivered to control stroke survivors (adjusted mean difference 0.5, 95% CI -0.4 to 1.4; p=0.26) (Table 4).

Characteristics of stroke survivors observed at 6 months

Between July 2011 and November 2013, 115 stroke survivors were recruited; 15 were lost to follow-up at six months (Figure 1). Cluster randomisation of teams achieved balance between experimental and control group stroke survivors observed at six months in terms of stroke type, home access, driving status, and walking ability (Table 5). However, more of the experimental group received publicly-funded, centre-based therapy than the control group.

Effect of intervention on stroke survivor behaviour: outings undertaken in real life

Experimental stroke survivors observed at six months undertook 9.0 (SD 3.0) outings per week in real life, compared with 7.4 outings (SD 4.0) undertaken by control stroke survivors (adjusted mean difference 0.5, 95% CI -1.8 to 2.8; p = 0.63) (Table 6). Experimental stroke survivors undertook 1.1 (95% CI 0.2 to 1.9; p = 0.02) more outings for home or personal maintenance reasons than control stroke survivors. There were no other statistically significant differences between groups for other purposes of outings, mode of travel, distance travelled or on the Life Space Assessment.

DISCUSSION

Community teams that received the Out-and-About program did not deliver more outings or outdoor-related sessions during therapy to stroke survivors than control teams that received guidelines only. Despite the use of evidence-based implementation strategies of audit and feedback, a training workshop, printed educational materials and identifying barriers to change, the behaviour of experimental teams did not change significantly. Consequently, in real life, stroke survivors that were seen by these experimental teams did not go on more
outings or travel further than those seen by control teams. Neither experimental nor control stroke survivors increased their number of outings.

The current trial was planned on the basis of the original study by Logan (4) in which 4.7 outdoor-related sessions delivered from home resulted in more than twice as many outdoor ‘journeys’ in real life than a control group, and the Out-and-About pilot study (10) which resulted in 18% more stroke survivors receiving ≥ 4 outdoor-related sessions during therapy. Furthermore, a recent multi-centre trial by Logan (19) of 6.8 outdoor-related sessions from home resulted in 1.4 times more outings per day in real life than a control group. However, the Out-and-About program delivered to 11 teams in the current trial did not increase outdoor-related sessions (1.5 at baseline vs 2.1 at 12 months) or outings (0.5 at baseline vs 1.0 at 12 months) during therapy. It was not surprising that the intervention did not increase outings undertaken in real life by stroke survivors (8.2/wk at baseline vs 8.2/wk at 12 months).

There are several possible reasons for the lack of behaviour change in the experimental teams. First, the intervention may not have been delivered by teams as planned. Staff turnover was high with up to 50% of staff leaving within the 12 months. New staff were often unaware of the study. Furthermore, despite staff training, experimental teams may have felt reluctant to coerce eligible stroke survivors to go outdoors, particularly early after discharge, as reported by therapists in the pilot study (13). Second, we may have recruited a different stroke population compared to previous studies (4). Although these stroke survivors stated that they wanted to get out more often, many were already going out at least once a day soon after discharge, similar to healthy older adults aged 75 years+, who report 8-10 weekly outings (20, 21). Therapists and stroke survivors may have decided that outings during therapy were not a priority if outings were already occurring daily. Third, the trial may have lacked the statistical power to detect a clinically significant difference. However, the mean difference of 4% of stroke survivors receiving > 4 outings during therapy was not clinically significant, and the confidence intervals (-9 to 17) did not cross the a priori worthwhile effect of 20%, suggesting that the trial was adequately powered. Finally, report-writing may have been poor, and teams may not have recorded outings. However, we are confident that outings were novel, time-consuming events, which were reported in detail.
One implication of the findings is that screening stroke survivors with a self-report diary may be useful, so that services can be allocated accordingly. For example, if a stroke survivor is already going out at least once daily, is satisfied with their level of participation and confident walking outdoors, no escorted outings may be needed. However, stroke survivors who are going out less than once daily may benefit from escorted outings. Therapists can explore individual barriers to getting out and offer targeted sessions. Another implication is that staff turnover needs to be factored into any implementation of evidence-based practice since high staff turnover is common in allied health professions, often due to maternity leave. Procedures for orienting new staff to interventions, and ‘passing on knowledge’ are needed.

A strength of this study was that the 22 teams were representative of teams delivering post-hospital stroke rehabilitation across Australia. A recent national audit (22) found that 49% of stroke survivors were referred for centre-based outpatient rehabilitation or day therapy and 37% referred for home-based rehabilitation, similar to our trial. The main limitation was the small number of medical records audited for some teams, which may not represent actual practice, despite records being selected consecutively.

CONCLUSIONS
The Out-and-About program did not change team or stroke survivor behaviour. Most stroke survivors were already getting out and about as often as people of the same age without stroke, therefore time-consuming outings cannot be recommended as routine practice for that population. However, it may be useful to screen community-dwelling stroke survivors for frequency of outings in order to identify those who do, and do not need, to be escorted on outings during therapy.
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**Appendix 1.** Description of the Out-and-About behaviour change program
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Teams assessed for eligibility (n=79)

Excluded (n=55) due to:
- Inclusion criteria (n=47)
- Declined to participate (n=4)
- Non-responders (n=4)

Teams audited for descriptive information (n=24, files=277)

Excluded due to provision of sufficient outings (n=2, files=14)

Teams included and randomised (n=22, files=263)

Excluded due to provision of sufficient outings (n=2, files=14)

0 mth

Experimental teams (n=11)
- Received Out-and-about program
  - Clinical guidelines
  - Feedback from file audits
  - Barrier identification
  - Education
  - Booster training session

Control teams (n=11)
- Received written information only
  - Clinical guidelines

Observed stroke survivors

0 mth

Stroke survivors assessed for eligibility (n=184) (n=238)

Excluded (n=129):
- Exclusion criteria (n=73)
- Declined (n=51)
- Non-responders (n=2)
- Other (n=3)

Lost to follow-up: (n=7; 13%)
- Declined (n=4; 7%)
- Too unwell (n=2; 4%)
- Non-responders (n=1; 2%)

Measured number of outings over 7 days [self-report diary]

(n=55) (n=60)

Lost to follow-up: (n=8; 13%)
- Declined (n=5; 8%)
- Too unwell (n=1; 2%)
- Non-responders (n=1; 2%)

6 mth

Measured change in stroke survivor behaviour
[# outings, self-report diary; distance travelled, GPS device]

(n=48) (n=52)

Lost to follow-up due to service cessation (n=1 team)

12 mth

Audited stroke survivors: Measured change in team behaviour
[% 4+ outings, medical file audit]

(n=11, files=164) (n=10, files=115)

Fig. 1 Design and flow of teams, audited stroke survivors and observed stroke survivors through the trial
**Table 1** Characteristics of teams at baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>All (n=22)</th>
<th>Randomised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of team, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre-based</td>
<td>17 (77)</td>
<td>8 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>8 (36)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day therapy</td>
<td>9 (41)</td>
<td>7 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>5 (23)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of team, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>17 (77)</td>
<td>8 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>5 (23)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapists employed per team, med (IQR)</td>
<td>3 (2-13)</td>
<td>3 (2-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outings during therapy, n stroke survivors (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 1</td>
<td>63 (23)</td>
<td>34 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 2</td>
<td>34 (12)</td>
<td>18 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 3</td>
<td>22 (8)</td>
<td>14 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 4</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td>9 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor-related sessions (#), mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outings</td>
<td>0.5 (1.3)</td>
<td>0.5 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor practice</td>
<td>0.7 (1.6)</td>
<td>0.6 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor information</td>
<td>0.3 (0.7)</td>
<td>0.3 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.5 (2.3)</td>
<td>1.4 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Characteristics of stroke survivors audited at baseline and 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Baseline (n=146)</th>
<th>12 months</th>
<th>Baseline (n=117)</th>
<th>12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of team, n stroke survivors (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre-based</td>
<td>101 (69)</td>
<td>118 (72)</td>
<td>75 (65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td>14 (10)</td>
<td>23 (19)</td>
<td>47 (63)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day therapy</td>
<td>87 (60)</td>
<td>95 (81)</td>
<td>28 (37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>46 (33)</td>
<td>46 (28)</td>
<td>40 (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding of team, n stroke survivors (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>100 (68)</td>
<td>108 (66)</td>
<td>87 (76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>46 (32)</td>
<td>56 (34)</td>
<td>28 (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (yr), mean (SD)</strong></td>
<td>67 (16)</td>
<td>68 (14)</td>
<td>67 (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex, n male (%)</strong></td>
<td>81 (55)</td>
<td>102 (62)</td>
<td>68 (59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>28 (19)</td>
<td>11 (7)</td>
<td>10 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>72 (49)</td>
<td>101 (62)</td>
<td>73 (64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
<td>14 (9)</td>
<td>9 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>28 (19)</td>
<td>18 (11)</td>
<td>19 (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11 (8)</td>
<td>20 (12)</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living situation, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>32 (22)</td>
<td>37 (23)</td>
<td>25 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/spouse</td>
<td>101 (69)</td>
<td>120 (73)</td>
<td>86 (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># Time post-stroke (days), med (IQR)</strong></td>
<td>50 (31-85)</td>
<td>43 (24-84)</td>
<td>64 (43-104)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side of stroke, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>70 (48)</td>
<td>66 (41)</td>
<td>49 (43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>55 (38)</td>
<td>81 (50)</td>
<td>63 (55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>21 (14)</td>
<td>16 (10)</td>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of stroke, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infarct</td>
<td>58 (40)</td>
<td>119 (73)</td>
<td>77 (67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemorrhage</td>
<td>20 (14)</td>
<td>21 (13)</td>
<td>25 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>66 (47)</td>
<td>24 (15)</td>
<td>13 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stroke severity (SSS 0-60), mean (SD)</strong></td>
<td>51 (4)</td>
<td>53 (4)</td>
<td>53 (4)</td>
<td>52 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependency (mRS 0-5), med (IQR)</strong></td>
<td>2 (2-3)</td>
<td>2 (2-3)</td>
<td>3 (2-3)</td>
<td>3 (2-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1, n (%)</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>34 (21)</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 2, n (%)</td>
<td>108 (74)</td>
<td>122 (74)</td>
<td>98 (85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>30 (21)</td>
<td>35 (30)</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>10 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-inpatient therapy received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^ Wait time (days), med (IQR)</td>
<td>14 (6-36)</td>
<td>17 (8-51)</td>
<td>21 (7-55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (days), med (IQR)</td>
<td>69 (36-131)</td>
<td>59 (30-110)</td>
<td>76 (41-126)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions (number), med (IQR)</td>
<td>10 (4 - 25)</td>
<td>10 (4 - 25)</td>
<td>13 (5-22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mRS = modified Rankin Scale, SSS = Scandinavian Stroke Scale. # Time post-stroke = days between stroke (or hospital admission) and first session with the therapy team. ^ Wait time = days between hospital discharge and first session with the therapy team.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outings during therapy</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Difference between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All * (n=146)</td>
<td>Experimental * (n=117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>173 (66)</td>
<td>88 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 1</td>
<td>90 (34)</td>
<td>58 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 2</td>
<td>48 (18)</td>
<td>35 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 3</td>
<td>28 (11)</td>
<td>20 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 4</td>
<td>19 (7)</td>
<td>13 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unadjusted raw data
** Adjusted for cluster randomisation
Table 4 Mean (SD) number of outdoor-related sessions during therapy for stroke survivors audited at 12 months by group and mean difference (95% CI) between groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outdoor-related sessions during therapy</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Difference between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All *</td>
<td>Experimental * (n=146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outings</td>
<td>1.0 (1.9)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor practice</td>
<td>0.8 (1.9)</td>
<td>0.7 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor information</td>
<td>0.2 (0.6)</td>
<td>0.2 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.1 (3.1)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Unadjusted raw data
** Adjusted for cluster randomisation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Included (n = 48)</th>
<th>Experimental (n = 7)</th>
<th>Control (n = 8)</th>
<th>Lost to follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of team, n stroke survivors (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre-based</td>
<td>46 (96)</td>
<td>6 (86)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding of team, n stroke survivors (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>42 (88)</td>
<td>6 (86)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6 (12)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (yr), mean (SD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 55, n (%)</td>
<td>69 (12)</td>
<td>63 (16)</td>
<td>59 (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;55, n (%)</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex, n male (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>25 (52)</td>
<td>5 (71)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>8 (17)</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>10 (21)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>5 (11)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living situation, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/spouse</td>
<td>35 (73)</td>
<td>7 (100)</td>
<td>7 (86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>11 (23)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time post-stroke (days), med (IQR)</strong></td>
<td>63 (44-92)</td>
<td>47 (24-79)</td>
<td>79 (54-120)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Side of stroke, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>28 (58)</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>16 (33)</td>
<td>4 (57)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependency (mRS 0-5), med (IQR)</strong></td>
<td>3 (2-3)</td>
<td>3 (2-3)</td>
<td>3 (2-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1, n (%)</td>
<td>9 (19)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 2, n (%)</td>
<td>39 (81)</td>
<td>6 (86)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of dwelling, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House/townhouse</td>
<td>43 (90)</td>
<td>6 (86)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit/apartment</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home access, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>32 (67)</td>
<td>7 (100)</td>
<td>6 (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground level access</td>
<td>12 (25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp/rails</td>
<td>3 (6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifts</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving status, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove before stroke</td>
<td>39 (48)</td>
<td>5 (71)</td>
<td>7 (88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers that resumed driving</td>
<td>8 (21)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking capacity (6MWT m), n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;100 m</td>
<td>7 (15)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199 m</td>
<td>15 (31)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299 m</td>
<td>8 (17)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>2 (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399 m</td>
<td>12 (25)</td>
<td>3 (43)</td>
<td>4 (50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥400 m</td>
<td>6 (13)</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>1 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking aids used outdoors, n (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>23 (48)</td>
<td>4 (57)</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-point/quad stick</td>
<td>11 (23)</td>
<td>2 (29)</td>
<td>3 (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking frame</td>
<td>9 (19)</td>
<td>1 (14)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair</td>
<td>4 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (12.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crutches</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mRS = modified Rankin Scale, Time post-stroke = days between stroke and baseline measure, 6MWT = 6-min Walk Test
Table 6 Mean (SD) number of outings and nature of outings undertaken (#/wk) by observed stroke survivors by group and mean (95% CI, p) difference between groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of outings</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Difference between groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month 0 * (n=55)</td>
<td>Month 6 * (n=60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outings (#/wk)</td>
<td>8.6 (2.5)</td>
<td>7.8 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of outings (#/wk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/personal maintenance</td>
<td>2.9 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-related</td>
<td>2.1 (0.9)</td>
<td>2.1 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1.8 (1.0)</td>
<td>2.4 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise-related</td>
<td>1.3 (1.2)</td>
<td>1.1 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.5 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.2 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of travel during outings (#/wk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>5.8 (1.7)</td>
<td>5.0 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>0.4 (0.2)</td>
<td>0.5 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>0.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>0.1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>0.1 (0.2)</td>
<td>0.1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scooter</td>
<td>0.0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.3 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2.9 (1.2)</td>
<td>2.2 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair</td>
<td>0.2 (0.3)</td>
<td>0.4 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance travelled during outings (km/wk)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Space Assessment (0-120)</td>
<td>54 (18)</td>
<td>47 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Up to 16 observations carried forward across both groups
* Unadjusted raw data
** Adjusted for cluster randomisation and baseline value
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Appendix 1: Description of the Experimental Intervention

Name
The experimental intervention was a behaviour change program referred to as the Out-and-About program.

Rationale
The aim of the behaviour change program was to increase the number of outings delivered to stroke survivors during outpatient rehabilitation. A target of six or more escorted outings was set for each stroke survivor, to be delivered by the treating occupational therapists and/or physiotherapists. The Out-and-About program included strategies that were known to be effective for changing practice, namely, educational meetings (7), printed educational materials including clinical guidelines (8), and audit and feedback (9). The program was piloted with five community rehabilitation teams (10) and was feasible to deliver. Furthermore, after 12 months, 39% of stroke survivors in the pilot sample received four or more outdoor-related sessions during therapy compared with 21% pre-intervention.

Description of the Out-and-About behavior change program
The experimental intervention consisted of the following components: a 2-hour initial training workshop with barrier analysis, and a 1-hour booster workshop 12 months later, printed educational materials, audit and feedback. Workshops were conducted onsite, face-to-face with each team, and presented by Dr Annie McCluskey. All available physiotherapists, occupational therapists and therapy assistants employed by the team were invited to attend in addition to the team leader.

The initial 2-hour training workshop involved:

- A description of the original evidence by Logan and colleagues (4) and related 2010 stroke guideline recommendation (5)
- Provision of verbal and written feedback from audits of the team’s medical files about the number of outings delivered during therapy to 15 of their previous stroke survivors
- Summary of barriers identified during the pilot study, and identification of local barriers to providing outings
- Identification of enablers to providing more outings in the future
- Printed educational materials and resources to help teams with implementation and delivery of six outings per stroke participant in future. The educational materials were compiled into a single handout, and consisted of (a) a screening checklist that enquired about frequency of outings, usual modes of travel pre-and post-stroke and driving intentions, (b) strategies for progressing outings from ‘easier’ to ‘more challenging’ while walking, taking a bus or train, using a motorised scooter, (c) the approved return to driving process and legislation, (d) links to local transport
resources and service providers; and (e) a checklist for teams to record the number of outings delivered during a stroke participant’s rehabilitation.

- Presentation of two case studies (from the pilot study) demonstrating how six outings might be provided by a team to individual stroke survivors
- Summary of the process and steps involved in the trial

Outings were to be conducted in local streets and suburbs by treating therapists (not by the researchers), and could include public transport training, practice walking over uneven ground, to parks and shopping malls, supervised practice using mobility equipment such as a motorised scooter where relevant, advice about and help with return to driving, and provision of written information about transport options in the local area.

Outings were to be delivered by a physiotherapist, an occupational therapist and/or or a therapy assistant (if one was available) employed by each team. No additional therapy staff were provided or required. The configuration of outings and specifics of outing content were individually tailored by treating therapists.

See Appendix 2 for the slides and handout provided during the initial workshop, and Appendix 3 for case studies presented.

The 1-hour booster workshop was also conducted by Dr Annie McCluskey, onsite for individual experimental teams, one year after the initial workshop. Identical slides and a handout from at the initial workshop were presented. The booster workshop consisted of:

- Re-presentation of the original feedback from audits of medical files to existing and new staff
- Discussion of barriers to stroke survivor outings, and how team barriers were being addressed.

Printed Educational Materials
The following materials were presented during the workshops and collated into a single document (see Appendix 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who designed</th>
<th>Who prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies for delivering outings and increasing level of difficulty (from ‘easier’ to ‘more challenging’), when walking, using buses and trains, a motorised scooter. Web links were also provided for local transport resources/services</td>
<td>Dr Annie McCluskey (Occupational therapist) Prof Louise Ada (Physiotherapist)</td>
<td>Ms Aspasia Karageorge (Psychology graduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening checklist</td>
<td>Dr Annie McCluskey (Occupational therapist) Prof Louise Ada (Physiotherapist)</td>
<td>Ms Aspasia Karageorge (Psychology graduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist for recording outings</td>
<td>Dr Annie McCluskey (Occupational therapist) Prof Louise Ada (Physiotherapist)</td>
<td>Ms Aspasia Karageorge (Psychology graduate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit and Feedback

Consecutive medical records of the most recently discharged stroke survivors were audited for each team, after recruitment to the study, at baseline but before teams were randomised. A sample of 20 medical records from the previous 12 months were requested, with the expectation that at least 15 records could be audited per team. Auditors were blinded to team allocation.

Data extracted from the medical records included demographics (age, gender, date of stroke, time post-stroke to first therapy session, stroke severity), duration for therapy program from first to last session, number and type of therapy sessions overall, number of escorted outings and outdoor-related sessions provided. See Appendix 6 for audit criteria. Data were recorded directly into an Excel spreadsheet, onsite, during audits.

Audit data were reported in tables and graphs, and presented to each experimental team at the initial workshop, and booster workshop, with comparisons provided for other teams (control and experimental teams). See Appendix 5 for a sample audit report provided to experimental teams only.
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Slides and handout provided during the initial (and booster) workshop
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Workshop Aims

By the end of today, you should be able to:

- Describe original RCT findings that you will be implementing (ie the evidence)
- Use audit feedback to discuss how team practice matches against 'best evidence'
- Identify local barriers to your service/TEAM providing more escorted outings to relevant clients
- Identify strategies that the service/team can use to overcome local barriers

The Out-and-About Trial: Background to the Study

- Cluster randomised trial, 2010-2012
- 20 teams (with OT and PT, NSW)
- 300 people with stroke
- Study aims:
  - To assist teams of OT/PT to increase outings after stroke
  - Determine the efficacy and cost effectiveness of the ‘Out-and-About’ training program for OTs/PTs

The Evidence

Out-and-About trial – original 2012-2013 training workshops – prepared by Annie McCluskey

Intervention to improve participation
Logan et al (2004), BMJ

The Evidence-Practice Gap: Audit Feedback

Baseline Audits

- 10 - 15 client records per site
- Consecutive stroke referrals, previous 12 months
- Days post-stroke/discharge to 1st assessment
- Duration of PT /OT program (days)
- Number PT /OT sessions
  - Total: Including other interventions (eg UL, domestic etc)
  - Outdoor mobility: Outings, outdoor practice, information provision

Mean number of escorted outings, outdoor practice and information sessions provided to people with stroke by OTs/PTs

Target = 6 escorted outings:
Current average <1 (0.53) escorted outing
Barriers to Providing Escorted Outings

Feasibility Study

- Participants: 13 AHPs interviewed across 2 teams
- Key barriers:
  - Client and family expectations about therapy
  - Therapists' skills and knowledge
  - Therapists' role expectations

BMC Health Services Research (2010)
Client and Family Expectations

Sometimes family members won’t let the person go out…..they’re worried what might happen….

They expect us to focus on their upper limb

McCluskey & Middleton, [2010]

Therapists’ Skills and Knowledge

I don’t use public transport – I wouldn’t know where to catch a bus or how much it costs for a ticket

I’ve never done transport training….it might be risky…what if someone has a fall in the shopping centre?

Professional Role Expectations

We ask about shopping and banking…..so we SHOULD do something to help people get there…..

I wouldn’t think to refer to OT for transport training… I’ve never seen them do that...

Enablers

If it was on our [assessment] form, that would prompt us to ask screening questions

We can involve the therapy assistant for some sessions

What are local barriers (and Enablers) for your team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills, intentions, beliefs, attitudes, roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-related</td>
<td>Expectations, beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team/care processes</td>
<td>Role extension or sharing, referral processes, use of support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational/resources</td>
<td>Space, equipment, vehicles, clinic times, printing of forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political-economic</td>
<td>Social influences, flow-on effects of withdrawing treatment, sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translating Evidence into Practice: Maintaining fidelity and therapy dosage

Out-and-About trial – original 2012-2013 training workshops – prepared by Annie McCluskey
Out-and-About trial – original 2012-2013 training workshops – prepared by Annie McCluskey
Other local barriers (and Enablers)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Knowledge, skills, intentions, beliefs, attitudes, roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-related</td>
<td>Expectations, beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team/care processes</td>
<td>Role extension or sharing, referral processes, use of support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational/ resources</td>
<td>Space, equipment, vehicles, clinic times, printing of forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political/ economic</td>
<td>Social influences, flow-on effects of withdrawing treatment, sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Next Steps

**Next Steps**

- Team member asks clients if we may phone them
  - All stroke patients/clients until 15 people recruited
  - Minimise team member ‘gatekeeping’

**Study Design and Flowchart**

Control Teams (n=11 teams x 15 stroke patients)
- Receive written education materials
- Stroke patients: Outcomes measured baseline and after 6 months

Experimental Teams (n=11 teams x 15 stroke patients)
- Receive Out-and-About implementation training program (audit feedback, identify /discuss barriers, education)
- Stroke patients: Outcomes measured at baseline and after 6 months

**Teams eligible to participate**
- Measure team outcomes [baseline file audits]
- Randomise teams
- Time
  - Month 0
  - Experimental Teams
  - Control Teams

**Teams screened for eligibility**
- 22 teams
- 300 stroke patients
- 10+ stroke patients/yr
- At least one OT & PT
- Day programs
- Out-patient services

**7-day diary of outings**
- 6 Minute Walk Test
- SF-36/ 6D
- Carry a GPS device for 7 days in 6 months

**Teams asked to phone clients**
- All stroke patients/clients until 15 people recruited

**Next Steps**

- Minimise team member ‘gatekeeping’
- We ask 2 screening questions about activities
- If eligible, we invite them to provide measures of participation now and 6 months later
- 6 Minute Walk Test, SF-36, 7-day diary (taxi to campus)
- Carry a GPS device for 7 days in 6 months
- Repeat file audit in 12 months
- 15 files per team/service
Out-and-About trial – original 2012-2013 training workshops – prepared by Annie McCluskey
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Appendix 3:

Case studies presented during the initial workshop
**Background: Mr T**

- 53 years old
- Lived with his wife
- Admitted to hospital for 8 weeks
- Referred to a **hospital-based** outpatient rehabilitation service for 8-12 weeks for physiotherapy and occupational therapy
- Difficulty walking: required a walking stick

**Therapy overview: Initial Asst**

- **6MWT**: 300 m with stick/close supervision
- **Local streets**: Able to walk half a block (~200 m) with supervision in 15 mins and return (30 mins)
- Walk to local shops = 4 blocks. Not yet able to manage distance

**Screening checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the month prior to stroke</th>
<th>In the last 2 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical condition</td>
<td>Medical condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
<td>Visual impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impairment</td>
<td>Hearing impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can see the doctor</td>
<td>Can see the doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can see a dentist</td>
<td>Can see a dentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can hardly hear</td>
<td>Can hardly hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t understand</td>
<td>Can’t understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a hearing aid</td>
<td>Have a hearing aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a washboard</td>
<td>Have a washboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a mobility aid</td>
<td>Have a mobility aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a walking stick</td>
<td>Have a walking stick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Long term goals:**

- To return to driving when possible – (Information needed about return to driving)
- To return to work as a lawyer, initially working from home then from inner-city office (Sessions to focus on catching trains)
- To walk the City to Surf in 12 months (Sessions to focus on increased walking endurance and speed)
1. Return to driving goals

To return to driving within 6 months

To notify RTA of stroke within 1 week

To discuss return to driving suitability with GP within 2 weeks

If formal assessment required, to refer himself to a driver-trained OT for assessment within 2 months

2. Walking goals

Within 5 weeks, to independently walk to the local coffee shop (700m), have coffee, and return home

To be able to negotiate kerbs independently within 2 weeks

To walk to the coffee shop in less than 30min, within 3 weeks unsupervised

To walk to the corner of street (400m) and back home in less than 20 mins within 2 weeks unsupervised

3. Train travel goals

To independently use a train to travel to his workplace in the city within 6 weeks

To confidently handle money and purchase a train ticket at the train station within 3 weeks

To catch a train to his workplace in the city, with the assistance of a therapist, within 4 weeks

Week 1

FIRST OUTING:

Escorted walk with OT & PT (joint session) for ½ a block beyond the hospital grounds

Week 2

No outings this week

Gym/home/community practice with PT: endurance, distance steps, kerbs

Return to driving process discussed with OT
**Week 3**

**SECOND OUTING:**

OT met Mr T at his home. Escorted walk to the train station at an off-peak time. Purchased a ticket, caught train 2 stops.

Therapy assistant met Mr T and OT and the train stop and drove them home.

**Week 4**

**THIRD OUTING:**

TA escorted Mr T to train station and caught a train to his workplace in the city then home again.

**Week 5**

No outing this week.

Unsupervised practice at home/community.

**Week 6**

**FOURTH OUTING:**

With OT, walked to coffee shop, ordered coffee, walked home.

**Goal:** less than 30 mins each way.

**Week 7**

No outings this week. Therapy with PT:

- walking up and down external stairs of the hospital.

- Reviewed walking time and distance goals.

**Week 8**

**FIFTH OUTING:**

Crossing busy/wide road, traffic lights and kerbs with PT outside hospital grounds.

**Week 9**

**SIXTH OUTING:**

Mr T walked to local coffee shop and back escorted by OT, no breaks, less than 25 mins each way

---

**Escorted Outings with Therapists**

**Physiotherapist:**
- 2 x outings (near hospital)
- No home visits

**Occupational therapist:**
- 4 x home visits/ outings (one with PT, one with TA)

**Therapy assistant:**
- 2 x outings (one with OT)

**Joint sessions:**
- Initial walking assessment (PT and OT)
- Train station session (OT and TA)

---

**Results**

**General Advice**

- When going on an outing, remember/consider taking:
  - Mobile phone
  - Map/street directory
  - Enough money to catch a taxi
  - Water, medications, and food (especially if diabetic)
  - Umbrella

- Managing with limited hand function:
  - Cue cards
  - Different kinds of bags

- Other tips:
  - Know the environment and the person’s functional status
  - Advise family of estimated time of return
  - Provide family with your contact number

---

**Background: Mrs H**

- 81 years old, lived alone, own home
- Main problems: poor balance (4WW rec. by inpatient PT) and unsteady gait; reduced hand function
- Referred to rehabilitation team immediately after discharge for 6 week PT/OT program
- Very active pre-stroke:
  - Drives a car
  - Walked to shops (approx 300m away, up hill, one pedestrian crossing)

---

**OUT AND ABOUT**

**Using a bus to access the community**

**Mrs H: Case study 2**

Acknowledgement:
Corrina Medlin, physiotherapist, TACP service, Bankstown-Lidcombe Hospital

---

Initial Assessment

- Mod Barthel: 92 (0 to 100)
- TUG: 13 s
- 6-MWT: 341 m
- x3 STS test: 18 s
- Berg BS: 48 (0 to 56)

Screening checklist

2. Which mode(s) of travel does the person want to resume/safely use in the next 3 months? (not below)
   - Return to driving
   - Public buses

3. Does the person hold a valid driver’s license? (tick one)
   - Yes, and he/she wants to return to driving
   - Yes, but he/she does not want to return to driving
   - No, he/she does not hold a valid driver’s license

Goals & sub-goals

To independently travel to the local shops and home again using the bus within 6 weeks

To walk unaided to the local bus stop (250m) and home again within 2 weeks

To confidently board the bus, negotiate seating and manage money, and then exit the bus on her own within 3 weeks

To complete a return bus journey to local shops with supervision within 4 weeks

Week 1

FIRST OUTING:
PT escorted Mrs H beyond hospital entrance with her 4WW

Week 2

SECOND OUTING:
Home visit. PT escorted Mrs H to the bus stop with 4WW
Week 3
First OT session held at hospital. Discussion about return to driving, bus timetables and money management.

THIRD OUTING:
OT: Escorted Mrs H to bus stop, caught bus in one direction, driven home by TA.

Week 4
FOURTH OUTING
PT escorted Mrs H for a walk outside the grounds of the hospital, focussing on kerbs and uneven ground, without the 4WW.

Week 5
FIFTH OUTING:
Home visit. OT escorted Mrs H to bus stop without 4WW. Practised use of shoulder bag to carry money and ticket. Caught bus one stop, then home again.

Week 6
No outing this week.
PT: At hospital, focussed on part practice of balance exercises and strength training for steps (on/off bus)

Week 7
SIXTH OUTING:
TA escorted Mrs H on a shopping trip, via bus, to local shops and home again. Mrs H carried shopping home in shoulder bag.

Escorted Outings with Therapists
• Physiotherapist:
  • 3 x sessions overall
  • incl 1 x home visit

• Occupational therapist:
  • 3 x sessions overall
  • incl 2 x home visits
  • 1 x with TA

• Therapy Assistant
  • 2 x sessions
  • 1 x with OT, 1 x alone

**Discharge ax**

- **MBI (0 to 100)**: 92 → 100
- **TUG**: 13s → 8.6s
- **6-MWT**: 341m → 400m (unaided)
- **x 3 STS test**: 18s → 10s, no hands
- **Berg BS (0 to 56)**: 48 → 54, tandem > 30s

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking: pavement, kerbs, rough ground, 400m</td>
<td>13s</td>
<td>8.6s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking: traffic lights, zebra crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking: crowds, escalators, elevators, stairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community transport: bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community transport: taxi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community transport: train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4:

Printed Educational Materials
INCREASING OUTINGS AFTER STROKE

Resource for use by rehabilitation professionals

Created as part of the Out-and-About trial 2010-2013
Logan and colleagues (2006) reported that walking outdoors was an important goal for people with stroke. Of 78 main goals, 22% focused on walking outdoors.

**Enquiries**

Dr Annie McCluskey  
Faculty of Health Sciences  
The University of Sydney  
Cumberland Campus (C42)  
PO Box 170  
Lidcombe NSW 1825  
AUSTRALIA  
Email: annie.mccluskey@sydney.edu.au  
Ph: 02 9351 9834
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COMMUNITY WALKING: PRACTICE

LEVEL 1
Easier
- Walk over kerbs; walk and turn; walk up slopes; walk across lawn; walk across rough ground such as pebbles, etc
- Walk with the person to a neighbour’s house and back, emphasising a long step length

LEVEL 2
More challenging
- Walk faster and further
- Cross a quiet street, then a busier street, then at traffic lights
- Walk with the person while they perform a task with their hands (e.g., getting money out of a bag)
- Walk a circuit that includes road crossings, kerbs, gradients
- Use elevators, escalators and stairs, with and without hand rails
- Walk through a crowded shopping mall
COMMUNITY WALKING: RESOURCES

General information for pedestrians:
Information about the different kinds of road crossings and signals for pedestrians in NSW (e.g., pedestrian, pelican, raised):

Pedestrian Council of Australia's policy statement on crossing roads (includes advice from the Australian Road Rules 1999 legislation):

Walking groups:
There are free-to-join Walking for Pleasure clubs all around NSW that walk regularly in places such as National Parks, places of historical interest, beaches and your local area.

Mall Walking
Many shopping centres hold free mall walking programs each week, catering for all ages and fitness levels. This can be a safe and social way to get out and about in the community. Below are examples of centres that have a Mall Walking program, however it is a good idea to check with your local centres too.

Macquarie Centre, North Ryde: every Wednesday from 7.00am - 8.00am. Phone 9887 0800

Stocklands Green Hills Centre: East Maitland, NSW 2323

Warringah Mall

Westfield Southland
LEVEL 1
Easier

- Get in and out of a bus in the hospital grounds (if possible) with a walking aid and a shopping bag
- Walk with the person to the bus stop, timing the duration and walking longer/ further during the next session
- Get to and from a train station platform, buy a ticket and read/interpret the train timetables
- Walk to a destination and catch a bus to return

LEVEL 2
More challenging

- Get on and off a bus carrying a walking aid and a shopping bag
- Plan a return trip on a bus/train, determining which steps the therapist and the person will initiate
- Get on and off a bus/train with the person but sit separately so they have to initiate getting off
- Plan an outing with the person where the therapist shadows the person by driving behind their bus or alongside their train
COMMUNITY TRANSPORT: RESOURCES

Public buses, trains and ferry:

Other community transport:

Accessibility:
- **Ferries**: all ferry terminals are wheelchair accessible. Maps, timetables and fares: [http://www.sydneyferries.info/wharves-and-maps.htm](http://www.sydneyferries.info/wharves-and-maps.htm)
- **Train accessibility**: All CityRail trains are accessible using a boarding ramp. Not all train stations are wheelchair-accessible, however. Find out if a specific train station is wheelchair accessible: [http://www.cityrail.info/stations/station_details](http://www.cityrail.info/stations/station_details)

Subsidised community travel:
**Motorised Scooters: Practice**

**LEVEL 1**

*Easier*

- Operate the scooter safely in the confines of the home or hospital: e.g., driving forward and back (reverse); adjusting the speed; stopping suddenly

- Operate the scooter in the driveway or other outdoor area of the home: e.g., performing 3-point and 2-point turns; travelling up and down gradients

- Navigate around other pedestrians in a scooter-friendly community environment (e.g., hire a scooter in a shopping centre where they are available for loan and drive around one level of the centre)

**LEVEL 2**

*More challenging*

- Perform more challenging manoeuvres outside: cross quiet and busy roads; negotiate dropped and non-dropped kerbs

- Park and secure the scooter in a community location (e.g., outside a shop)

- Complete a return-journey in the scooter to a nearby shop or friend’s house; navigate the scooter outdoors and indoors, and then drive home
MOTORISED SCOOTERS: RESOURCES

Scooter hire in shopping centres:
Motorised scooters can be trialled at a local shopping complex. Examples include:

**Campbelltown Mall**: wheelchair and electric scooter hire - ph 4629 9200
**Warringah Mall**: A free service supplies scooters to customers – ph 1800 245 642

**Stockland shopping centres**: Motorised scooters are available for hire. To book, phone:
- Glendale: (02) 4954 9666
- Wetherill Park: (02) 9609 7766.
- Merrylands: (02) 9682 1855

**Westfield shopping centres**: All Westfield shopping centres provide free scooters for customers. Bookings can be made by calling the local customer service desk.
- Penrith: (02) 4721 4354
- Liverpool: (02) 9602 6633
- Eastgardens: (02) 9344 6766
- Parramatta: (02) 9891 3929
- Hornsby: (02) 9477 5111
- Chatswood: (02) 9412 1555

Scooter hire in the community:

Purchasing a motorised scooter

**Scooter Smart** offer a free, no obligation, in-house scooter trial. They also offer advice on the best scooter for the person’s needs.
www.scootersmart.com.au

**Second-hand mobility equipment** for sale through the NSW Independent Living Centre:
www.ilcnsw.asn.au/assets/2h_Equip.pdf

Scooter Safety
In NSW and the ACT, a licence, registration and insurance are not required provided that:
- The scooter does not weight more than 110kg, and
- The scooter does not travel faster than 10 km/h.
  (see  www.seniorsmovingsafely.org.au/scooters.html )

**Scooter Safety Guide** including a self-assessment checklist:

**Help Cut Mobility Scooter Accidents** guide, published by the ACCC:
www.accc.gov.au/content/index.phtml/itemId/945577

Funding Options
www.australian-mobilityscooters.com/funding-for-mobility-scooters.html
**Notify RMS about stroke**

The person has a legal obligation to notify the Roads & Maritime Service (RMS) about the condition prior to driving by either,

- a) attending a RMS registry, or
- b) phoning 13 22 13

The RMS will provide the person with a RMS Medical Report form to be taken to his/her medical specialist for completion.

**Assessment by medical specialist**

The person must take the RMS Medical Report form to be completed by his/her medical specialist (e.g., neurologist, rehabilitation physician, not a GP). The person must submit the completed report to the RMS (in person or by post). Based on the completed report, the RMS will advise the person of one of the following outcomes:

- **RMS disability test**
  - The person must pass a disability test before driving can resume.

- **Driving assessment**
  - Referral to a driver-trained occupational therapist for an driving assessment.

- **Medical review**
  - The person must be assessed further by a medical specialist.

**Additional assessment required**

One of the following assessments must occur before a decision about return to driving can be made by the RMS:

- Medically fit to drive
  - The person must wait for a letter from the RMS before driving.

- License with conditions
  - License issued by RMS with specific conditions (e.g., vehicle modifications, radius restriction, daylight hours only).

- Medically unfit to drive
  - License cancelled by RMS.

**Discuss driving cessation**

Discuss alternatives to driving e.g., public and community transport, taxi services, walking.
**RETURN TO DRIVING: INFORMATION**

"Legislation requires a **driver** to advise the [Roads and Maritime Service] of any permanent or long-term injury or illness that affects his or her safe driving ability. These laws can impose penalties for failure to report."

*Austroads* (2006) p.10

---

**General information:**

For general information regarding return to driving, visit the [Roads and Maritime Service NSW website](http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au)

**Organising an occupational therapy driving assessment:**

- A list of **driver-trained occupational therapists** can be found at the website of the OT-Australia-NSW website under the heading ‘Find an OT’

- **Occupational therapy driving assessments:**
  These may be conducted by private or public services:
  - *Public services* are usually geographically limited
  - *Private services* are more expensive, but generally have shorter wait-lists
**SCREENING CHECKLIST**

1. **ASAP**, ask the person with stroke to report the frequency of use of each mode of transport: (tick one box for each of the two timeframes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>In the month prior to stroke</th>
<th>In the last 2 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking in the community</td>
<td>At least once a day</td>
<td>At least once a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public bus</td>
<td>Every 2 – 3 days</td>
<td>Every 2 – 3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>At least once a wk</td>
<td>At least once a wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>Less than once a wk</td>
<td>Less than once a wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy van or shuttle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car (as the driver)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car (as a passenger)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorised scooter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Which mode(s) of travel does the person want to resume/learn to use in the next 3 months? (list below)

3. Does the person hold a valid driver's license? (tick one)
   - [ ] Yes, and he/she wants to return to driving
   - [ ] Yes, but he/she does not want to return to driving
   - [ ]
INCREASING OUTINGS: CHECKLIST

AIM: Six escorted outings beyond the boundary of the person’s property or hospital grounds

- Walking: pavement, kerbs, rough ground, hills
- Walking: traffic lights, zebra crossings
- Walking: crowds, escalators, elevators, stairs
- Community transport: bus
- Community transport: taxi
- Community transport: train

No, he/she does not hold a valid driver’s license
Appendix 5:

Individualised audit feedback report
The Out-and-About trial: Improving quality of life after stroke - Feedback from audits of 7 medical records for people with stroke treated by Team T.

Presented by Dr Annie McCluskey
Monday 8 October 2012

The Out-and-About trial 2012 – Feedback from medical record audits for Team T
Outings = An event whereby the patient and therapist travel outside of the front gate of the person’s house or the perimeter of the hospital/rehab unit.

Outdoor practice = An event whereby the patient and therapist travel outdoors, but within the confines of the patient’s home or the hospital/rehab unit grounds.

Information provision = An event whereby the therapist provides specific information (verbal or written) to a patient about modes of accessing the community (includes information about external rails, community transport services, mobility scooters and return to driving processes)

Mean number of outings, outdoor practice and information sessions provided to a person with stroke by OTs/PTs
## Outings, Outdoor practice and Information Provision provided to patients (per team)

|          | All teams | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | F  | G  | H  | I  | J  | K  | L  | M  | N  | P  | R  | S  | T  |
|----------|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| **OUTINGS** |           |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Mean     | .52       | 1.28 | .33 | .91 | .75 | .20 | .83 | .60 | .20 | .12 | .77 | .25 | .05 | .31 | .00 | 1.50 | .33 |
| SD       | 2.18      | 2.08 | .62 | 1.37 | 1.61 | .56 | 1.34 | 1.40 | .56 | .33 | 1.16 | .71 | .23 | 1.11 | .00 | 1.83 | .52 |
| Median   | 0         | .50 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | 1.00 | .00 |
| UQ-LQ    | 1-0       | 1-0 | 1-0 | 1-0 | 0-0 | 2-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 1-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 2-5-0 | 1-0 |
| Min-Max  | 0-7       | 0-7 | 0-2 | 0-4 | 0-6 | 0-2 | 0-4 | 0-2 | 0-1 | 0-3 | 0-2 | 0-1 | 0-4 | 0-0 | 0-6 | 0-1 |    |    |
| **OUTDOOR PRACTICE** |           |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Mean     | .76       | 1.17 | .87 | .18 | .25 | .93 | .42 | .07 | .13 | .12 | .62 | 3.00 | .75 | 1.85 | .00 | 1.08 | .33 |
| SD       | 1.74      | 1.85 | 1.64 | .40 | .77 | 2.31 | .67 | .26 | .35 | .33 | 1.04 | 4.12 | 1.97 | 2.03 | .00 | 1.00 | .52 |
| Median   | 0         | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | 1.50 | .00 | 2.00 | .00 | 2.00 | .00 |
| UQ-LQ    | 1-0       | 1-0 | 1-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 1-0 | 1-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 1-0 | 0-0 | 5-0 | 0-0 | 2-0 | 0-0 | 2-0 | 1-0 |
| Min-Max  | 0-12      | 0-6 | 0-6 | 0-1 | 0-3 | 0-9 | 0-2 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-3 | 0-12 | 0-8 | 0-6 | 0-0 | 0-2 | 0-1 |    |    |
| **INFORMATION** |           |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Mean     | .27       | .78 | .47 | .36 | .13 | .00 | .08 | .20 | .07 | .24 | .31 | .13 | .20 | .15 | .00 | .17 | .33 |
| SD       | .72       | 1.16 | 1.30 | .92 | .34 | .00 | .29 | .41 | .26 | .44 | .48 | .35 | .41 | .38 | .00 | .58 | .52 |
| Median   | 0         | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
| UQ-LQ    | 0-0       | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 0-0 | 1-0 |
| Min-Max  | 0-5       | 0-4 | 0-5 | 0-3 | 0-1 | 0-0 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-1 | 0-2 | 0-1 |    |
| # Files  | 251       | 18  | 15  | 11  | 16  | 12  | 15  | 15  | 17  | 13  | 10  | 20  | 13  | 9   | 16  | 7   |    |    |

SD = Standard Deviation; UQ = Upper Quartile (.75); LQ = Lower Quartile (.25)
## Duration, frequency and latency of physiotherapy and/or occupational therapy provided to patients (per team)

|                              | All teams | A          | B          | D          | F          | G          | H          | I          | J          | K          | L          | M          | N          | P          | R          | S          | T          |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| **Therapy duration (days)**  | Mean      | 96.1       | 40.7       | 97.7       | 84.9       | 78.6       | 53.2       | 207        | 91         | 72.6       | 122.8      | 80.2       | 403.7      | 54.2       | 51.7       | 307.5      | 71.83      | 163        |
|                             | SD        | 130        | 28         | 57         | 98         | 75         | 46         | 292        | 76         | 22         | 115        | 67         | 356        | 61         | 24         | 293        | 55         | 114        |
|                             | Median    | 64         | 37.5       | 126        | 65.5       | 67         | 31         | 104.5      | 76         | 76         | 83         | 67         | 382.5      | 39         | 57         | 172        | 56         | 171        |
| **# PT/OT sessions**        | Mean      | 14.5       | 7.6        | 7.0        | 6.5        | 21.5       | 14.9       | 12.8       | 6.5        | 10.4       | 29.8       | 11.0       | 44.7       | 8.8        | 20.2       | 12.0       | 6.75       | 17.33      |
|                             | SD        | 16.1       | 5.5        | 8.17       | 5.95       | 21         | 12         | 17.0       | 9.6        | 5.3        | 26         | 8.9        | 50.4       | 9.0        | 12.3       | 11.2       | 4.0        | 10.3       |
|                             | Median    | 11         | 6          | 5          | 4          | 15.5       | 11         | 5.5        | 2          | 11         | 17         | 8          | 14.5       | 5.5        | 20         | 8.5        | 6.5        | 17         |
| **Days post stroke to 1st contact** | Mean  | 72.1       | 36.9       | 82.1       | 127.3      | 64.0       | 91.6       | 250.4      | 75.2       | 119.5      | 59.9       | 54.0       | 151.1      | 67.9       | 85.8       | 83.7       | 39.8       | 135        |
|                             | SD        | 72         | 43         | 37.3       | 51.9       | 56         | 34         | 351        | 66         | 52         | 53.5       | 57         | 81.0       | 37.1       | 60         | 84         | 48         | 124        |
|                             | Median    | 50         | 15         | 78         | 119        | 52.50      | 61         | 101.5      | 60.5       | 99         | 45.5       | 40         | 110.5      | 58.5       | 67         | 38         | 21         | 86         |
| **Days post hospital d/c to 1st contact** | Mean  | 28.4       | 5.3        | 32.5       | 42.0       | 13.6       | 13.9       | 150.3      | 25.6       | 42.4       | 24.2       | 25.5       | 104.3      | 33.5       | 59.8       | 33.0       | 11.73      | 38         |
|                             | SD        | 42         | 2.9        | 35.6       | 31.9       | 18         | 16        | 188        | 17         | 45         | 31         | 59         | 93.7       | 24.6       | 72         | 26.8       | 17.1       | 34         |
|                             | Median    | 13         | 6          | 18         | 30         | 5.5        | 7          | 71         | 27         | 26         | 13.5       | 7          | 85         | 26         | 25         | 24.5       | 6          | 25         |

SD = Standard Deviation; UQ = Upper Quartile (.75); LQ = Lower Quartile (.25)
### Patient stroke severity, at time of intake, for files audited (per team)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRS score *</th>
<th>All teams</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSS score **</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>51.9</th>
<th>52.0</th>
<th>49.1</th>
<th>53.5</th>
<th>49.8</th>
<th>53.7</th>
<th>49.4</th>
<th>51.7</th>
<th>51.4</th>
<th>53.0</th>
<th>53.2</th>
<th>50.4</th>
<th>51.3</th>
<th>51.5</th>
<th>52.0</th>
<th>51.2</th>
<th>52.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = The **Modified Rankin Scale (MRS)** is a single item, global outcomes rating scale for patients post-stroke. It is used to categorize level of functional independence, ranging from 0 (no symptoms at all) to 6 (dead).

** = The **Scandinavian Stroke Scale (SSS)** is a categorical scale, where several endpoints for neurological performance (speech, gait, motor performance, etc) are rated on several multi-item subscales. This measure focuses on the side of the body affected by stroke. The individual ratings are added and summarized as a total score ranging from 2 (most severe disability) to 58 (least severe disability).
Appendix 6:

Audit criteria
### SECTION 1: Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Age at Stroke</th>
<th>Gender (Male = 1, Female = 0)</th>
<th>Marital Status (1=married, 2=divorced, 3=widowed, 4=single, 5=unknown)</th>
<th>Living Situation (1=spouse/family, 2=alone, 3=other, 4=unknown)</th>
<th>Date of Stroke</th>
<th>Side of Stroke (1-right, 2-left, 0=unknown)</th>
<th>Type of Stroke (0=unknown, 1-infarct, 2-hemorrhage)</th>
<th>Date of Hospital D/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 2: OT/PT Session and General Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Therapist Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Coded as:</th>
<th>Entered SPSS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the screening question below along with the date and which team member.

Examples of screening question:

- How is the client getting out and about?
- Family?
- Transit?
- Driving?
- Who is doing the shopping, etc?

Write outdoor mobility, transport and community participation goals in the general notes section exactly as they are reported in the patient file and by which professionals.

Any other Notes about Patient and file:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Date (referral to the service)</th>
<th>Date of First Contact with an OT/PT in team</th>
<th>Date of D/C from Program or last session</th>
<th>Days Since Hospital D/C to 1st Contact with team</th>
<th>Days Post Stroke to 1st Assessment</th>
<th>Days in the program</th>
<th>Stroke Within Previous 6 Months yes=1, no=0</th>
<th>Stroke Severity MRS Score</th>
<th>Stroke Severity SSS Score</th>
<th>Number of PT/OT Sessions</th>
<th>Screening Questions Asked Yes=1, N=0</th>
<th>Goals Made?</th>
<th>Yes=1, N=0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the screening question below along with the date and which team member.

Examples of screening question:

- How is the client getting out and about? Family? Transit? Driving? Who is doing the shopping, etc?

Write outdoor mobility, transport and community participation goals in the general notes section.

Goals Made:

- yes=1, N=0